arXiv:1303.2605v1 [math.AP] 11 Mar 2013

MODULATIONAL INSTABILITY AND VARIATIONAL STRUCTURE

JARED C. BRONSKI AND VERA MIKYOUNG HUR

Abstract. We study the modulational instability of periodic traveling waves for a class of Hamiltonian systems in one spatial dimension. We examine how the Jordan block structure of the associated linearized operator bifurcates for small values of the Floquet parameter and derive a criterion governing instability to long wavelengths perturbations in terms of the kinetic and potential energies, the momentum and the mass of the underlying wave as well as their derivatives. The dispersion operator of the equation is allowed to be nonlocal, for which Evans function techniques may not be applicable. We illustrate the result by discussing equations of Korteweg-de Vries type.

1. Introduction

We study the stability and instability of periodic traveling waves for a class of Hamiltonian systems in one spatial dimension, in particular, equations of Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) type

$$u_t - \mathcal{M}u_x + f(u)_x = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

in the theory of wave motion. Here $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is typically proportional to elapsed time and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is usually related to the spatial variable in the primary direction of wave propagation; $u = u(x,t)$ is real valued, frequently representing the wave profile or a velocity. Throughout we express partial differentiation either by a subscript or using the symbol ∂. Moreover $\mathcal{M}$ is a Fourier multiplier defined as $\widehat{\mathcal{M}u}(\xi) = m(\xi)\hat{u}(\xi)$, characterizing the dispersion in the linear limit, while f determines the nonlinearity. In many examples of interest, f obeys a power law.

Perhaps the best known among equations of the form (1.1) is the KdV equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + (u^2)_x = 0$$

itself, which was put forward in [Bou77] and [KdV95] to model the unidirectional propagation of surface waves with small amplitudes and long wavelengths in shallow water; it has since found relevances in other situations such as Fermi-Pasta-Ulam lattices (see [FPU55], for instance). Observe, however, that (1.1) is *nonlocal* unless the dispersion symbol m is a polynomial of $i\xi$. Examples with nonlocal dispersion include the Benjamin-Ono equation (see [Ben70] and [Ono75]) and the intermediate long wave equation (see [Jos77]), for which $m(\xi) = |\xi|$ and $\xi \coth \xi - 1$, respectively, while $f(u) = u^2$. Another interesting example, proposed by Whitham [Whi74] to describe "breaking" of shallow water waves, corresponds to $m(\xi) = \sqrt{\tanh \xi / \xi}$ and $f(u) = u^2$. Incidentally the quadratic nonlinearity is characteristic of many wave phenomena.

A traveling wave solution of (1.1) takes the form $u(x,t)=u(x+ct)$, where $c\in\mathbb{R}$ and u satisfies by quadrature that

$$\mathcal{M}u-f(u)-cu-a=0 \tag{1.2}$$

for some $a\in\mathbb{R}$. In other words, it steadily propagates at a constant speed without changing the configuration. For a broad range of dispersion symbols and nonlinearities, a plethora of periodic traveling waves of (1.1) may be attained from variational arguments, e.g., the mountain pass theorem applied to a suitable functional whose critical point satisfies (1.2). The associated spectral problem

$$\mu v=\mathcal{M}v_x-(f'(u)v)_x-cv_x$$

is the subject of investigation here.

As Alan Newell explained in [New85], "if dispersion and nonlinearity act against each other, monochromatic wave trains do not wish to remain monochromatic. The sidebands of the carrier wave can draw on its energy via a resonance mechanism, with the result that the envelop becomes modulated." Benjamin and Feir [BF67] and independently Whitham [Whi67] formally argued that Stokes' periodic waves at the surface of deep water would be unstable to perturbations by certain, small frequency waves, namely the *modulational* or Benjamin-Feir instability. Corroborating results arrived about the same time by Lighthill [Lig65], Ostrovsky [Ost67], Benney and Newell [BN67], Zakharov [Zak68a, Zak68b], among others. See also [Whi74] and references therein. Modulational instability occurs in numerous physical systems such as optics (see [Ost67, Zak68a, AL84, THT86, HK95], for instance) and plasmas (see [Has72, MB89], for instance).

Recently an extensive body of work has aimed at translating the formal modulation theory in [Whi74], for instance, into rigorous mathematical results. It would be impossible to do justice to all advances in the direction, but we single out a few — [OZ03a, OZ03b, Ser05] for conservation laws with viscosity, [DS09] for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, and [BJ10, JZ10] for equations of KdV type. See [BM95] for the Benjamin-Feir instability of Stokes' waves in a channel of finite depth.

In particular in [BJ10] a rigorous calculation of long wavelengths perturbations was made for (local) KdV equations with general nonlinearities, henceforth called generalized KdV equations, via Evans function techniques as well as the Bloch wave decomposition. Under certain nondegeneracy conditions, specifically, the spectrum of the associated linearized operator in the vicinity of the origin was shown to take a normal form — either the spectrum consists of the imaginary axis with multiplicity three or it contains three lines through the origin, one in the imaginary axis and two in other directions; the latter implies instability. In addition the normal form was determined through an index, which was effectively calculated in terms of conserved quantities of the PDE, together with their derivatives with respect to constants of integration arising in the traveling wave ODE.

Here we take matters further and derive a criterion governing spectral instability near the origin of periodic traveling waves for a general class of Hamiltonian systems in one* spatial dimension. We shall make a few structural assumptions — mainly the existence of a conserved momentum and a Casimir invariant, interpreted as the mass — but do not otherwise restrict the form of equations, considerably broadening the scope of applications. Of particular interest is the case of nonlocal dispersion, for which Evans function techniques[†] and other ODE methods (which are instrumental in [BJ10], for instance, in the derivation of index formulae) may not be applicable. Instead we perform a spectral perturbation of the associated linearized operator in terms of the Floquet parameter and substitute ODE based approaches by functional analytic ones. Note that variational properties of the equation help us to determine the stability index without recourse to the small amplitude wave limit. Lin [Lin08] devised a continuation argument to generalize the stability theory of solitary waves in [GSS87, BSS87, PW92], among others, to a class of nonlinear nonlocal equations; see [HJ12] for an adaptation in the periodic wave setting.

---

*The assumption that the equation is set in one spatial dimension merely enters in the derivation of a Pohozaev type identity, which is to avoid inversion of a linearized operator; see Lemma 2.9.

Our results are most explicit in the case of KdV type equations with fractional dispersion, which we will illustrate in Section 3 and Section 4. In particular we shall determine the modulational instability index in terms of the kinetic and potential energies, the momentum and the mass of the underlying wave train, together with their derivatives with respect to Lagrange multipliers for the traveling wave equation as well as the wave number. In the case of the quadratic power-law nonlinearity we shall further express the index in terms of the potential energy, the momentum and the mass as functions of Lagrange multipliers associated with conservations of the momentum and the mass.

2. Abstract framework

We shall derive a sufficient condition for spectral instability to long wavelengths perturbations of periodic traveling waves, for a class of Hamiltonian systems in one spatial dimension under a few structural assumptions. They will be stated as they are needed.

2.1. Preliminaries.

Consider a Hamiltonian system of the form

$$u_t = J\delta H(u), \tag{2.1}$$

where J is a linear skew-symmetric operator, independent of u, H is a Hamiltonian and δ denotes variational differentiation.

Throughout we will work in the L^2-based Sobolev space setting. We employ the notation $\langle\,,\rangle$ for the L^2-inner product.

Assumption 2.1 (Conservation laws)**.** Assume that (2.1) possesses in addition to H two conserved quantities, denoted P and M. Assume that H, P, M are smooth in an appropriate function space and invariant under spatial translations. Moreover assume that

(P) $J\delta P(u) = u_x$,
(M) $\ker(J) = \operatorname{span}\{\delta M(u)\}$.

We refer to P and M as the momentum and the mass, respectively. Assumption (P) states that P generates spatial translations while assumption (M) implies that M is a Casimir invariant of the flow induced by (2.1). Thanks to Noether's theorem, conservation of the momentum is expected whenever (2.1) is invariant under spatial translations.

[†] We note, however, that the approach in [GLM07, GLZ08], for instance, realizing the Evans function as a regularized Fredholm determinant may be more generally applicable than the standard ODE based formulation.

Equations of KdV type in (1.1) satisfy Assumption 2.1, where $J = \partial_x$,

$$H = \int \Big(\frac{1}{2}u\mathcal{M}u - F(u)\Big)\,dx, \qquad F' = f,$$
$$P = \int \frac{1}{2}u^2\,dx \quad \text{and} \quad M = \int u\,dx.$$

More generally, if L is a positive Fourier multiplier then

$$Lu_t - \mathcal{M}u_x + f(u)_x = 0$$

satisfies Assumption 2.1, where $J = L^{-1}\partial_x$,

$$H = \int \Big(\frac{1}{2}u\mathcal{M}u - F(u)\Big)\,dx,$$
$$P = \int \frac{1}{2}uLu\,dx \quad \text{and} \quad M = \int u\,dx.$$

Examples include the Benjamin-Bona-Mahony equation.

A traveling wave solution of (2.1) takes the form $u(x,t) = u(x + ct + x_0)$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the wave speed, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is the spatial translate and u satisfies that

$$cu_x = J\delta H(u). \tag{2.2}$$

Or equivalently, u arises as a critical point of

$$E(u; c, a) := H(u) - cP(u) - aM(u) \tag{2.3}$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. In other words, it satisfies that

$$\delta E(u; c, a) = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Indeed, since

$$\langle \delta M(u), u_x\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} M(u)_x\,dx = 0$$

it follows from (M) that u_x is orthogonal to $\ker(J)$. Applying J^{-1} to (2.2) we then find that (P) implies (2.4).

Assumption 2.2 (Periodic traveling waves)**.** Assume that (2.1) admits a smooth, four-parameter family of periodic traveling waves, denoted $u(\cdot + x_0; c, a, T)$, satisfying (2.2), or equivalently (2.4), where u is even and T-periodic for some $T > 0$, the period.

The existence of periodic traveling waves of (2.1) usually follows from variational arguments. To illustrate, we shall discuss in Proposition 3.2 a minimization problem for a family of KdV equations with fractional dispersion. The symmetry assumption is to break that (2.1) is invariant under spatial translations.

Differentiating (2.4) with respect to x_0 and c, a, respectively, we use (P) and (M) to obtain that

$$\delta^2 E u_{x_0} = 0, \qquad J\delta^2 E u_{x_0} = 0, \tag{2.5a}$$
$$\delta^2 E u_c = \delta P, \qquad J\delta^2 E u_c = u_x = u_{x_0}, \tag{2.5b}$$
$$\delta^2 E u_a = \delta M, \qquad J\delta^2 E u_a = 0. \tag{2.5c}$$

Moreover

$$M_c = \langle \delta M, u_c\rangle = \langle \delta^2 E u_a, u_c\rangle = \langle u_a, \delta^2 E u_c\rangle = \langle u_a, \delta P\rangle = P_a. \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2.3. Perhaps (2.5a) through (2.5c) are familiar to readers from thermodynamics, where the free energy — E in the present setting — serves as a generating function of various quantities of interest. Specifically they are found as appropriate derivatives of the free energy with respect to the Lagrange multipliers for the associated variational problem. The equality of mixed partial derivatives then leads to relations among their derivatives, known as Kirchhoff's equations.

Remark 2.4. The period T enters calculations in a slightly different manner from other, periodic traveling wave parameters x_0, c, a. Although $\delta^2 E u_T = 0$, formally, i.e., with the set of smooth functions as the domain of $\delta^2 E$, nevertheless, u_T is not in general T-periodic. Rather u_T exhibits a secular growth, linear in x. Later we shall take a linear combination of u_T and xu_x to form a T-periodic function and construct a Pohozaev type identity.

Here and in the sequel, we may regard H, P, M, evaluated at a periodic traveling wave $u(\cdot+x_0; c, a, T)$ of (2.1) and restricted to one period, as functions of c and a, the Lagrange multipliers associated with conservations of the momentum and the mass, respectively, as well as the period T. Therefore we are permitted to differentiate H, P, M with respect to the periodic traveling wave parameters c, a, T. We shall ultimately derive a modulational instability index in terms of H, P, M together with their derivatives with respect to c, a, T. Corresponding to the translational invariance of the equation, x_0 plays no significant role in the present development. Hence we may mod it out.

Linearizing (2.1) about a periodic traveling wave $u = u(\cdot\,; c, a, T)$ in the frame of reference moving at the speed c, we arrive at that

$$v_t = J\delta^2 E(u; c, a)v =: \mathcal{L}(u; c, a)v. \tag{2.7}$$

Seeking a solution of the form $v(x,t) = e^{\mu t}v(x)$, we in turn arrive at the spectral problem

$$\mu v = \mathcal{L}(u; c, a)v. \tag{2.8}$$

We then say that u is (spectrally) *unstable* if the $L^2(\mathbb{R})$-spectrum of $\mathcal{L}$ intersects the open, right half plane of $\mathbb{C}$. Note that v needs not have the same period as u, namely a modulational or sideband perturbation.

In the case of the (local) generalized KdV equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + f(u)_x = 0, \qquad \text{where } f \text{ is a nonlinearity,} \tag{2.9}$$

one may relate the spectrum of the associated linearized operator to eigenvalues of the monodromy map (or called the periodic Evans function). As a matter of fact, a study in [BJ10] of the characteristic polynomial of the monodromy map led to two kinds of stability indices. The first counts modulo two the total number of positive eigenvalues in the periodic functions setting and it generalizes that governing the stability of solitary waves in [GSS87, BSS87, PW92], among others. The second, on the other hand, furnishes a sufficient condition for instability to long wavelengths perturbations and it makes rigorous the formal modulation theory in [Whi74], for instance. The present purpose is to generalize the notion of the second index to a general class of Hamiltonian systems, allowing nonlocal dispersion, for which Evans function techniques and other ODE methods may not be applicable. Instead we rely upon a Bloch wave decomposition of the associated spectral problem. Lin [Lin08] utilized a continuation argument to generalize the first index to a class of nonlinear nonlocal equations in the solitary wave setting; see [HJ12] for an adaptation in the periodic wave setting.

It is standard from Floquet theory (see [Chi06], for instance) that any eigenfunction of (2.8) takes the form

$$v(x)=e^{i\tau x}\phi(x), \qquad \text{where } \phi \text{ is } T\text{-periodic and } \tau\in(-\pi/T,\pi/T]$$

denotes the Floquet parameter. Accordingly (2.8) renders the one-parameter family of spectral problems

$$\mu\phi=e^{-i\tau x}\mathcal{L}(u;c,a)e^{i\tau x}\phi=:\mathcal{L}_\tau(u;c,a)\phi, \tag{2.10}$$

suggesting us to study $L^2_{per}([0,T])$-spectra of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$. Notice that the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ consists merely of discrete eigenvalues. Moreover it is standard from Floquet theory that $\operatorname{spec}_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}(\mathcal{L})=\bigcup_\tau \operatorname{spec}_{L^2_{per}([0,T])}(\mathcal{L}_\tau)$.

One does not expect to be able to compute the spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ for an arbitrary τ, however, except in few special cases, e.g., completely integrable systems; we refer the reader to [BD09], for instance. Instead we are going to restrict the attention to when the Floquet parameter τ and the eigenvalue μ are both small. Physically this amounts to long wavelengths perturbations or slow modulations of the underlying, periodic traveling wave. Specifically we will study the spectrum of the unmodulated operator $\mathcal{L}_0=\mathcal{L}$ at the origin. Note that zero is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_0$, thanks to the latter equations in (2.5a) and (2.5c). We will then examine how the spectrum near the origin of the modulated operator $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ bifurcates from that of $\mathcal{L}_0$ for $|\tau|$ small.

We promptly discuss "nondegeneracy" assumptions for a periodic traveling wave of (2.1), under which the generalized $L^2_{per}([0,T])$-null space of $\mathcal{L}_0=\mathcal{L}$ supports a Jordan block structure.

Assumption 2.5 (Nondegeneracies)**.** Assume that

(N1) $u(\cdot\,;c,a,T)$ is not constant;
(N2) $\ker(\delta^2E(u;c,a))=\operatorname{span}\{u_x\}$;
(N3) $G:=M_cP_a-M_aP_c\neq 0$.

In what follows, we employ the notation

$$\{f,g\}_{x,y}=f_xg_y-f_yg_x \tag{2.11}$$

and we may write $G=\{M,P\}_{c,a}$.

Assumption (N1) means that the underlying, periodic traveling wave is nondegenerate. It is not a serious assumption since if the profile of the underlying wave is constant then the stability analysis is easy. In the case of the quadratic nonlinearity, for which the related, time evolution equation enjoys the Galilean invariance, this amounts to understanding the stability of the zero state.

Assumption (N2), on the other hand, means the nondegeneracy of the linearized operator associated with the traveling wave equation; that is, the kernel is spanned merely by spatial translations. It proves a spectral condition, which plays a central role in the stability of traveling waves (see [Wei87, Lin08] among others) and in the blowup analysis (see [KMR11], for instance) for the related, time evolution equation, and it necessitates a proof. Indeed one may cook up a polynomial nonlinearity, say, $f(u)$, for which the kernel of $-\partial_x^2-f'(u)$ at the underlying wave is two dimensional at isolated points.

In the case of (local) generalized KdV equations (see (2.9)), the nondegeneracy of the linearization at a periodic traveling wave was identified in [BJ10] with the requirement that the wave amplitude not be a critical point of the period; moreover it was verified in [Kwo89], among others, at ground states in all dimensions. By a ground state, incidentally, we mean a traveling wave solution that is positive and radial and which vanishes at infinity. These proofs utilize shooting arguments and the Sturm-Liouville theory for ODEs, and they may not be applicable to nonlocal operators. Nevertheless, Frank and Lenzmann [FL12] recently demonstrated (N2) at ground states for a family of nonlinear nonlocal equations, which we shall follow in Proposition 3.5.

Assumption (N3) implies that the mapping $(c,a)\mapsto(P,M)$ is of C^1 and locally invertible, namely the nondegeneracy of the constraint set for the periodic, traveling wave equation. We shall verify it in Lemma 3.10 in the case of KdV equations with fractional dispersion near the solitary wave limit. Notice that G may vanish along a curve of co-dimension one. As a matter of fact, we shall discuss later that a change in the sign of G signals an eigenvalue of δ^2E crossing from the left half plane of $\mathbb{C}$ to the right through the origin.

Lemma 2.6 (Jordan block structure)**.** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2 and Assumption 2.5, the generalized null space of* $\mathcal{L}_0=\mathcal{L}_0(u;c,a)$ *acting on* $L^2_{per}([0,T])$ *possesses the Jordan block structure:*

(J1) $\dim(\ker(\mathcal{L}_0))=2$,
(J2) $\dim(\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^2)/\ker(\mathcal{L}_0))=1$,
(J3) $\dim(\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^{n+1})/\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^n))=0$ *for* $n\geqslant 2$ *an integer.*

Specifically

$$v_1:=u_a,\qquad w_1:=M_c\delta P-P_c\delta M,\tag{2.12a}$$

$$v_2:=u_x,\qquad w_2:=J^{-1}(M_au_c-M_cu_a),\tag{2.12b}$$

$$v_3:=u_c,\qquad w_3:=P_a\delta M-M_a\delta P\tag{2.12c}$$

form bases of the generalized null eigenspaces of $\mathcal{L}_0$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger$*, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{L}_0v_1=0,\qquad \mathcal{L}_0^\dagger w_1=0,\tag{2.13a}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_0v_2=0,\qquad \mathcal{L}_0^\dagger w_2=w_3,\tag{2.13b}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_0v_3=v_2,\qquad \mathcal{L}_0^\dagger w_3=0.\tag{2.13c}$$

Here and elsewhere, the dagger means adjoint. Moreover

$$\langle w_j,v_k\rangle=(M_cP_a-M_aP_c)\delta_{jk}=G\delta_{jk},\tag{2.14}$$

where $\delta_{jk}=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } j=k,\\ 0 & \text{if } j\neq k.\end{cases}$

Proof. Note from the latter equations in (2.5a) and (2.5c) that $v_1,v_2\in\ker(\mathcal{L}_0)$. Note from Assumption 2.2 that v_1,v_3,w_1,w_3 are even functions and v_2,w_2 are odd. Since $v_2\not\equiv 0$ by (N1), it follows from the former equations in (2.5a) and (2.5c) that v_1 and v_2 are linearly independent. Since (N2) implies that $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0)$ is at most two dimensional, therefore, $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0)=\operatorname{span}\{v_1,v_2\}$. A duality argument then leads to that $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger)=\operatorname{span}\{\delta M,\delta P\}$ and, furthermore, (N3) implies that w_1 and w_3 form a basis of $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger)$.

To proceed, notice that $v_3 \in \ker(\mathcal{L}_0^2)$, obviously, but $v_3 \notin \ker(\mathcal{L}_0)$ by (N1). If $v \in \ker(\mathcal{L}_0^2)/\ker(\mathcal{L}_0)$ then $\mathcal{L}_0 v = v_1$, which in light of (N3) admits no solutions other than v_3 by the Fredholm alternative. A dual statement follows mutatis mutandis, noting that $M_a u_c - M_c u_a$ is orthogonal to δM and thereby is in range(J). Similarly $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^3)/\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^2)$ is empty since $\mathcal{L}_0 v = v_3$ admits no solutions by the Fredholm alternative. □

In case $G = 0$, the Jordan block structure of the generalized null space of $\mathcal{L}_0$ is necessarily larger than (J1)-(J3). Since $\langle w_j, v_k\rangle = 0$ for $j \neq k$, indeed, either there must be an element in $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger)$ which is linearly independent of v_1 and v_2, or since v_j's would then lie in $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger)^\perp = \text{range}(\mathcal{L}_0)$, there must be elements in $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^2)$ and $\ker(\mathcal{L}_0^3)$, linearly independent of v_3.

Here and elsewhere, the subscript $\perp$ means the orthogonal complement.

In the case of the (local) generalized KdV equation (see (2.9)), whose traveling wave equation reduces by quadrature to

$$\frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + F(u) + \frac{1}{2}cu^2 + au = b, \qquad \text{where} \quad F' = f, \tag{2.15}$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$, stability indices were effectively calculated in [BJ10], for instance, in terms of P, M, T as functions of c, a, b (although the results may be restated in terms of H, P, M). When dealing with abstract Hamiltonian systems, however, the second constant of integration b may not be available and we opt to choose T as a periodic traveling wave parameter instead. We shall then express the modulational instability index in terms of H, P, M as functions of c, a, T. The present approach seems to have added advantages that u_a, u_x, u_c are T-periodic, as opposed to in [BJ10], and they form a basis of the periodic, generalized null space of $\mathcal{L}_0$, in link with variational properties of the equation. Formulae do become cumbersome, but in the absence of the extra feature that an additional quadrature furnishes, this seems the only way forward.

2.2. **Jordan block perturbation and modulational instability.**

Let $u(\cdot; c, a, T)$ be a periodic traveling wave of (2.1), satisfying Assumption 2.2 and Assumption 2.5. This subsection concerns the $L^2_{per}([0,T])$-spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_\tau(u; c, a)$, in (2.10), near the origin for $|\tau|$ small, for which a Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff expansion reveals that

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau(u; c, a) = L_0(u; c, a) + i\tau L_1(u; c, a) - \frac{1}{2}\tau^2 L_2(u; c, a) + \cdots, \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$L_0(u; c, a) = \mathcal{L}_0(u; c, a), \quad L_1(u; c, a) = [L_0, x], \quad L_2(u; c, a) = [L_1, x], \tag{2.17}$$

and so on. Notice that L_0, L_1, $L_2, \dots$ are well-defined in $L^2_{per}([0,T])$ even though x is not. In the case of the (local) generalized KdV equation (see (2.9)), for instance,

$$L_0 = \partial_x(-\partial_x^2 - f(u) - c), \quad L_1 = -3\partial_x^2 - f(u) - c, \quad L_2 = -6\partial_x.$$

Recall from Lemma 2.6 that zero is a generalized $L^2_{per}([0,T])$-eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_0$, with algebraic multiplicity three and geometric multiplicity two, with a basis $\{v_j\}$ and a dual basis $\{w_j\}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, of the generalized null space, satisfying (2.13a)-(2.13c) and (2.14). For $|\tau|$ small, thereby, three eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ bifurcate from the origin. We shall determine when bifurcating eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ leave the imaginary axis to derive a modulational instability index.

Varying τ in (2.10) for $|\tau|$ small, in view of (2.16), we arrive at the perturbation problem

$$\Big(L_0+\epsilon L_1+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 L_2+O(\epsilon^3)\Big)\phi(\epsilon)=\mu(\epsilon)\phi(\epsilon), \tag{2.18}$$

where $\mu,\epsilon\in\mathbb{C}$ are near $\mu=0$, $\epsilon=0$ and $\phi\in L^2_{per}([0,T])$. Note that ϵ is related to the Floquet parameter τ via $\epsilon=i\tau$.

Eigenvalues of (2.18) in the neighborhood of the origin in general bifurcate merely continuously in the perturbation parameter ϵ, but *not* in the C^1 manner. Rather they admit Puiseaux series in fractional powers of ϵ. Requiring that

$$\langle w_1, L_1 v_2\rangle=0 \quad\text{and}\quad \langle w_3, L_1 v_2\rangle=0, \tag{2.19}$$

however, eigenvalues do depend upon the perturbation parameter in the C^1 manner; a proof based upon the Fredholm alternative may be found in [BJ10, Theorem 4]. In applications in Section 3 and Section 4, we shall in fact show that

$$\langle w_j, L_\ell v_k\rangle=0 \qquad \text{whenever } j+k+\ell \text{ is even}, \tag{2.20}$$

where $j,k=1,2,3$ and $\ell=0,1,2$. Hence we may posit that

$$\mu(\epsilon)=\epsilon\mu_1+\epsilon^2\mu_2+\cdots \quad\text{and}\quad \phi(\epsilon)=\phi_0+\epsilon\phi_1+\epsilon^2\phi_2+\cdots. \tag{2.21}$$

For generalized KdV equations (see (2.9)), incidentally, the eigenvalue bifurcation is analytic.

Note from the Fredholm alternative that $L_0\phi=b$ is solvable if $b\in\text{range}(L_0)=\ker(L_0^\dagger)^\perp$ and the solution is defined up to an element in $\ker(L_0)$. Below we will write the solution as $\phi=L_0^{-1}b$, with the understanding that $\text{range}(L_0^{-1})\perp\text{span}\{w_1,w_2\}$. As a reminder,

$$\ker(L_0)=\text{span}\{v_1,v_2\} \quad\text{and}\quad \text{range}(L_0)=\text{span}\{w_1,w_3\}^\perp. \tag{2.22}$$

Substituting into (2.18) the eigenvalue and eigenfunction representations in (2.21), at the order of $\epsilon^0=1$,

$$L_0\phi_0=0,$$

whence $\phi_0=c_1v_1+c_2v_2$ for some $c_1,c_2\in\mathbb{C}$.

At the order of ϵ, correspondingly,

$$L_0\phi_1+L_1\phi_0=\mu_1\phi_0,$$

which by virtue of the Fredholm alternative is solvable if

$$\begin{aligned}0=&\langle w_1,(\mu_1-L_1)\phi_0\rangle=c_1(\mu_1\langle w_1,v_1\rangle-\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle)+c_2(\mu_2\langle w_1,v_2\rangle-\langle w_1,L_1v_2\rangle),\\ 0=&\langle w_3,(\mu_1-L_1)\phi_0\rangle=c_1(\mu_1\langle w_3,v_1\rangle-\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle)+c_2(\mu_2\langle w_3,v_2\rangle-\langle w_3,L_1v_2\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Since the last terms on the right sides vanish by (2.19), these reduce with the help of (2.14) to that

$$c_1(\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle-\mu_1G)=0 \quad\text{and}\quad c_1\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle=0.$$

Therefore, $c_1=0$[‡] and

$$\phi_0=c_2v_2, \qquad \phi_1=c_2L_0^{-1}(\mu-L_1)v_2+c_3v_1. \tag{2.23}$$

[‡] This implies that the kernel of L_0 is spanned by two elements while $L_0+\epsilon L_1$, three eigenfunctions for ϵ small but non-zero, while in the limit as $\epsilon\to 0$ three eigenfunctions attain the same limit. Numerical experiments bear this out.

Since ϕ_1 is determined merely up to an element in $\ker(L_0)$ one must add $c_3v_1+c_4v_2$ to it. Any component in the v_2 direction, however, may be absorbed to ϕ_0. Hence, without loss of generality, we set $c_4=0$. This is equivalent to fixing normalization in the perturbation theory for symmetric operators.

To proceed, at the order of ϵ^2,

$$L_0\phi_2+L_1\phi_1+\frac{1}{2}L_2\phi_0=\mu_1\phi_1+\mu_2\phi_0,$$

which by the Fredholm alternative is solvable if $\langle w_1, L_0\phi_2\rangle=0$ and $\langle w_3, L_0\phi_2\rangle=0$. Substituting (2.23) we arrive at that

$$\begin{aligned}c_2\langle w_1, L_0^{-1}(\mu_1-L_1)v_2\rangle+c_3\langle w_1, L_1\phi_1\rangle+\frac{1}{2}c_2\langle w_1, L_2v_2\rangle\\ =c_2\mu_1\langle w_1, L_0^{-1}(\mu_1-L_1)v_2\rangle+c_3\langle w_1,v_1\rangle+c_2\mu_2\langle w_1,v_2\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}c_2\langle w_3, L_0^{-1}(\mu_1-L_1)v_2\rangle+c_3\langle w_3, L_1\phi_1\rangle+\frac{1}{2}c_2\langle w_3, L_2v_2\rangle\\ =c_2\mu_1\langle w_3, L_0^{-1}(\mu_1-L_1)v_2\rangle+c_3\langle w_3,v_1\rangle+c_2\mu_2\langle w_3,v_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Or equivalently,

$$\begin{pmatrix}a_{22}\mu_1^2+b_{22}\mu_1+c_{22} & a_{23}\mu_1+b_{23}\\ a_{32}\mu_1^2+b_{32}\mu_1+c_{32} & a_{33}\mu_1+b_{33}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}c_2\\ c_3\end{pmatrix}=0, \tag{2.24}$$

where, after simplifying various inner products with the help of (2.14) and (2.19) and utilizing $L_0^{-1}v_2=w_3$ by the former equation in (2.13c) and the latter equation in (2.22),

$$a_{22}=-\langle w_1, L_0^{-1}v_2\rangle=-\langle w_1,w_3\rangle=0, \tag{2.25a}$$
$$b_{22}=\langle w_1, L_1L_0^{-1}v_2\rangle+\langle w_1, L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle=\langle w_1, L_1v_3\rangle, \tag{2.25b}$$
$$c_{22}=-\langle w_1, L_1L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle w_1, L_2v_2\rangle, \tag{2.25c}$$
$$a_{23}=-\langle w_1,v_1\rangle=-G, \tag{2.25d}$$
$$b_{23}=\langle w_1, L_1v_1\rangle, \tag{2.25e}$$

and

$$a_{32}=-\langle w_3, L_0^{-1}v_2\rangle=-\langle w_3,w_3\rangle=-G, \tag{2.25f}$$
$$b_{32}=\langle w_3, L_1L_0^{-1}v_2\rangle+\langle w_3, L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle=\langle w_3, L_1v_3\rangle+\langle w_2, L_1v_2\rangle, \tag{2.25g}$$
$$c_{32}=-\langle w_3, L_1L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle w_3, L_2v_2\rangle, \tag{2.25h}$$
$$a_{33}=-\langle w_3,v_1\rangle=0, \tag{2.25i}$$
$$b_{33}=\langle w_3, L_1v_1\rangle. \tag{2.25j}$$

Observe that (2.24) is a quadratic eigenvalue problem, which may be transformed into a linear matrix pencil of the form $(\mathbf{B}-\mu_1G\mathbf{A})\vec{c}=0$, after the change of variables $c_2\mapsto -G^{-1}c_2$ and $c_1=(a_{32}\mu_1+b_{32})c_2$, so long as $G\neq 0$. Consequently (2.24) is equivalent to

$$(\mathbf{B}-\mu_1G\mathbf{A})\vec{c}:=\left(\begin{pmatrix}0 & -Gc_{32} & b_{33}\\ 1 & -b_{32} & 0\\ 0 & -Gc_{22} & b_{23}\end{pmatrix}-\mu_1G\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -1 & 0\\ 0 & b_{22} & 1\end{pmatrix}\right)\begin{pmatrix}c_1\\ c_2\\ c_3\end{pmatrix}=0. \tag{2.26}$$

Since $\mathbf{A}$ is invertible, (2.24) or (2.26) is further equivalent to

$$(\mathbf{D}-\mu_1 G\mathbf{I})\vec{c}=0,$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}:=\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -Gc_{32} & b_{33} \\ -1 & b_{32} & 0 \\ b_{22} & -Gc_{22}-b_{22}b_{32} & b_{23} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.27}$$

In view of (2.18) and (2.21), since $\epsilon = i\tau$ and since μ_1 is an eigenvalue of (2.24), or equivalently (2.26), we determine a spectral curve of (2.10) near the origin for $|\tau|$ small. We summarize the conclusion.

Theorem 2.7 (Local normal form)**.** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2, Assumption 2.5 and* (2.19)*, three $L^2_{per}([0,T])$-eigenvalues of* (2.10) *in the form*

$$\mu_j(\tau)=iG^{-1}\mu_j\tau+O(\tau^2),\qquad j=1,2,3, \tag{2.28}$$

bifurcate from zero for $|\tau|$ small, where μ_j's are eigenvalues of $\mathbf{D}$.

Furthermore, a complex eigenvalue of $\mathbf{D}$ implies instability and the characteristic polynomial, or equivalently $\det(\mathbf{D}-\mu G\mathbf{I})$, leads to a modulational instability index. A straightforward calculation reveals that

$$\det(\mathbf{D}-\mu G\mathbf{I}):=-G^3\mu^3+D_2\mu^2+D_1\mu+D_0, \tag{2.29}$$

where

$$D_2:=G^2(b_{23}+b_{32})=G^2(\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle+\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle+\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle), \tag{2.30a}$$

$$D_1:=G(b_{22}b_{33}-b_{23}b_{32}+Gc_{32}), \tag{2.30b}$$

$$D_0:=G(c_{22}b_{33}-c_{32}b_{23}). \tag{2.30c}$$

Corollary 2.8 (Modulational instability)**.** *Under Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2, Assumption 2.5 and* (2.19) *a periodic traveling wave $u(\cdot\,;c,a,T)$ of* (2.1) *is unstable to long wavelengths perturbations if* $\det(\mathbf{D}-\mu G\mathbf{I})$ *admits a complex root, i.e., if the modulational instability index*

$$\Delta:=D_2^2D_1^2+4G^3D_1^3-4D_2^3D_0-27G^6D_0^2-18G^3D_2D_1D_0 \tag{2.31}$$

is negative, where D_2,D_1,D_0 are specified in (2.30a) *through* (2.30c) *with the help of* (2.25a)-(2.25e)*,* (2.25f)-(2.25j)*.*

We therefore derive a modulational instability index in terms of various inner products between basis and dual basis elements of $\ker(L_0)$ as well as L_0^{-1},L_1,L_2. We may in turn restate the result in terms of H, P, M together with their derivatives with respect to c, a, T.

We remark that while $\mathbf{D}$ is made up of terms up to second order in various inner products, the characteristic polynomial is homogeneous: $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{D})$ is linear in inner products, $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{D}^2)$ is quadratic and $\det(\mathbf{D})$ is cubic.

2.3. **Pohozaev identity techniques.** One may calculate various inner products in (2.25a)-(2.25e) and (2.25f)-(2.25j) using definitions in (2.12a)-(2.12c) and (2.17), except $\langle w_1, L_1 L_0^{-1} L_1 v_2\rangle$ and $\langle w_3, L_1 L_0^{-1} L_1 v_2\rangle$ in (2.25c) and (2.25h). The goal of this subsection is to develop periodic Pohozaev-type identities, which enable us to calculate the stability index without recourse to inversion of L_0.

Lemma 2.9 (Periodic Pohozaev-type identity)**.** *If u is T-periodic and satisfies* (2.2) *then $\psi := xu_x + Tu_T$ is T-periodic and satisfies*

$$L_0\psi = L_0(xu_x + Tu_T) = L_1 u_x. \tag{2.32}$$

If in addition u is even and satisfies Assumption 2.5 then

$$L_0^{-1} L_1 v_2 = \psi - G^{-1}\langle w_1, \psi\rangle v_1. \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. Since $L_0 u_x = 0$, we may write that

$$L_1 u_x = L_0(xu_x) - xL_0 u_x = L_0(xu_x)$$

in the non-periodic functions setting, acting on smooth functions. Unfortunately we must modify it in the periodic functions setting. For one thing, although $L_0 x - xL_0$ is well-defined in the periodic setting, $L_0 x$ and xL_0 individually are *not*. Another, related, is that xu_x is not T-periodic. Instead it develops a jump in the derivative over one period:

$$[xu_x]_0^T = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [(xu_x)_x]_0^T = Tu_{xx}(T; c, a, T).$$

As noted in Remark 2.4, this is what causes u_T to fail to lie in the periodic kernel of $\delta^2 E$. Specifically $\delta^2 E u_T = 0$, acting on smooth functions, but u_T is *not* T-periodic. Rather

$$[u_T]_0^T = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad [(u_T)_x]_0^T = -u_{xx}(T; a, c, T).$$

We may then observe that the jump in the derivative of Tu_T cancels that in xu_x, so that $xu_x + Tu_T$ makes a T-periodic function. Therefore (2.32) follows. Incidentally the vector field $x\partial_x + T\partial_T$ corresponds to a simultaneous rescaling of space and the period, maintaining periodicity.

To proceed, since L_0^{-1} is defined up to an element in $\ker(L_0)$,

$$L_0^{-1} L_1 v_2 = \psi + c_1 v_1 + c_2 v_2$$

for some c_1, c_2 constants. A parity argument then dictates $c_2 = 0$. Since $\text{range}(L_0^{-1}) \perp \{w_1, w_2\}$, moreover, (2.33) follows upon taking the inner product against w_1 and utilizing (2.14). ☐

Here we tacitly assume the continuity of $xu_x + Tu_T$ and $(xu_x + Tu_T)_x$ across the period so that $xu_x + Tu_T$ lies in the domain of the Hamiltonian. We shall establish in Proposition 3.2 that a periodic traveling wave of a KdV equation with fractional dispersion is in fact smooth if it arises as a constrained energy minimizer.

The apparent lack of an identity like (2.32) in higher spatial dimensions is the main obstruction in extending the present development to high dimensions.

Concluding the subsection we discuss another identity, related to (2.32), which will be instrumental in calculating inner products involving $\psi = xu_x + Tu_T$ in terms of constants of integration for the equation.

Lemma 2.10. *If f is smooth and $F' = f$ then*

$$\langle f(u), \psi \rangle_{L^2_{per}([0,T])} = \langle f(u), xu_x + Tu_T \rangle = -\Big(\Omega \int_0^T F(u)\ dx\Big)_\Omega, \tag{2.34}$$

where $\Omega = 1/T$ denotes the wave number.

Proof. After integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f(u), xu_x + Tu_T \rangle &= \int_0^T (xu_x f(u(x)) + Tu_T f(u(x)))\ dx \\ &= TF(u)(T) - \int_0^T F(u)(x)\ dx + T \int_0^T u_T f(u)(x)\ dx.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\Big(\int_0^T F(u)\ dx\Big)_T = F(u(T)) + \int_0^T u_T f(u)\ dx,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f(u), xu_x + Tu_T \rangle &= T\Big(\int_0^T F(u)\ dx\Big)_T - \int_0^T F(u)\ dx \\ &= T^2\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T F(u)\ dx\Big)_T = -\Big(\Omega \int_0^T F(u)\ dx\Big)_\Omega.\end{aligned}$$

□

3. Application: KdV equations with fractional dispersion

We shall illustrate the results in Section 2 by discussing the KdV equation with fractional dispersion

$$u_t - \Lambda^\alpha u_x + (u^2)_x = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where $0 < \alpha \leqslant 2$ and $\Lambda = \sqrt{-\partial_x^2}$ is defined via the Fourier transform as $\widehat{\Lambda u}(\xi) = |\xi|\hat{u}(\xi)$, representing fractional derivatives. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, alternatively,

$$\Lambda^\alpha u(x) = C(\alpha)\, PV \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{1+\alpha}}\ dy,$$

where PV stands for the Cauchy principal value and $C(\alpha)$ is an appropriate normalization constant.

In the case of $\alpha = 2$, notably, (3.1) recovers the KdV equation while in the case of $\alpha = 1$ it corresponds to the Benjamin-Ono equation. In the case[§] of $\alpha = -1/2$, moreover, it was argued in [Hur12] to approximate up to quadratic order the water wave problem in two spatial dimensions in the infinite depth case. Observe that (3.1) is nonlocal for $0 < \alpha < 2$. Incidentally fractional powers of the Laplacian arise in numerous applications, such as dislocation dynamics in crystals (see [CDLFM07], for instance) and financial mathematics (see [CT04], for instance).

The present treatment may be adapted mutatis mutandis to general power-law nonlinearities; see Remark 3.3. We focus on the quadratic nonlinearity, however, to simplify the exposition. Incidentally the convective acceleration is characteristic of many wave phenomena; we refer the reader to [Whi74].

[§] Note that $\Lambda^\alpha \partial_x$ is not singular for $\alpha \geqslant -1$.

Throughout the section and the following, we will work in the periodic, L^2-based Sobolev space setting over the interval $[0,T]$, where $T>0$ is fixed although at times it is regarded as a free parameter. We define a periodic Sobolev space of fractional order via the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])}=\int_0^T (u^2+u\Lambda^\alpha u)\ dx,$$

where $0<\alpha<2$. We use $\langle\cdot\,,\cdot\rangle$ for the inner product on $L^2_{per}([0,T])$.

3.1. **Periodic traveling waves of** (3.1)**.** Notice that (3.1) may be written in the Hamiltonian form (2.1), where $J=\partial_x$ and

$$H(u)=K(u)+U(u), \tag{3.2}$$

$$K(u)=\int_0^T \frac{1}{2}u\Lambda^\alpha u\ dx \quad\text{and}\quad U(u)=\int_0^T -\frac{1}{3}u^3\ dx. \tag{3.3}$$

To interpret, K and U are, respectively, the kinetic energy and the potential energy. Notice that (3.1) possesses in addition to H two conserved quantities

$$P(u)=\int_0^T \frac{1}{2}u^2\ dx \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$M(u)=\int_0^T u\ dx, \tag{3.5}$$

which correspond, respectively, to the momentum and the mass. Clearly H, P, M are smooth in $H^\alpha_{per}([0,T])\cap L^3_{per}([0,T])$. Since

$$\delta P(u)=u \quad\text{and}\quad \delta M(u)=1, \tag{3.6}$$

moreover, H, P, M satisfy Assumption 2.1. In addition (3.1) is invariant under

$$u(t,x)\mapsto \lambda^\alpha u(\lambda(x+x_0),\lambda^{\alpha+1}t) \tag{3.7}$$

for any $\lambda>0$ for any $x_0\in\mathbb{R}$.

A periodic traveling wave of (3.1) takes the form $u(x,t)=u(x+x_0+ct)$, where $c\in\mathbb{R}$, $x_0\in\mathbb{R}$ and where u is T-periodic, satisfying by quadrature that

$$\Lambda^\alpha u-u^2-cu-a=0 \tag{3.8}$$

for some $a\in\mathbb{R}$ (in the sense of distributions). Or equivalently,

$$\delta E(u;c,a):=\delta(H(u)-cP(u)-aM(u))=0. \tag{3.9}$$

Henceforth we shall write a periodic traveling wave of (3.1) as $u=u(\cdot\,;c,a)$. In a more comprehensive description, it is specified by four parameters c, a and T, x_0. But $T>0$ is fixed. Corresponding to the translational invariance of the equation, moreover, x_0 may be modded out.

A solitary wave, whose profile vanishes asymptotically, corresponds to $a=0$ and $T=\infty$ simultaneously.

Clearly a periodic traveling wave of (3.1) satisfies (2.5a)-(2.5c) and (2.6). Below we develop integral identities that a periodic solution of (3.8), or equivalently (3.9), a priori satisfies and which will be useful in various proofs.

Lemma 3.1 (Integral identities)**.** *If* $u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T]) \cap L^3_{per}([0,T])$ *satisfies* (3.8) *then*

$$2P + cM + aT = 0, \tag{3.10}$$

$$2K + 3U - 2cP - aM = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

$$(\alpha+1)K + 2U - cP + W = 0, \qquad \text{where} \quad W = TE_T. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. Integrating (3.8) over $[0,T]$ manifests (3.10).

Multiplying (3.8) by u and integrating over $[0,T]$ lead to (3.11). Multiplying the equation by $xu_x + Tu_T$ and integrating over $[0,T]$, moreover, lead with the help of (2.34) to that

$$(\alpha-1)K - U + cP + aM + W = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Indeed, since $[\partial_x \Lambda^\alpha, x] = (\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha$ by brutal force, an integration by parts reveals that

$$\int_0^T xu_x \Lambda^\alpha u \; dx = \frac{\alpha-1}{2}\int_0^T u\Lambda^\alpha u \; dx.$$

Combining (3.11) and (3.13) then proves (3.12). Incidentally we may write in view of Lemma 2.10 that

$$\langle \Lambda^\alpha u, \psi\rangle = \langle \Lambda^\alpha u, xu_x + Tu_T\rangle = \alpha K - (\Omega K)_\Omega, \tag{3.14}$$

where $\Omega = 1/T$. □

In the case of $\alpha = 2$, periodic traveling waves of (3.1), namely the KdV equation, are well known to be expressible in closed form, called cnoidal waves (see [KdV95], for instance). In the case of $\alpha = 1$, moreover, Benjamin [Ben70] manipulated the Poisson summation formula and he explicitly calculated periodic traveling waves of (3.1). In general, the existence of periodic traveling waves of (3.1) may follow from variational arguments, although one may lose the explicit form of the solution. In the $H^{\alpha/2}$-subcritical case, i.e., $\alpha > 1/3$, in particular, a family of periodic traveling waves of (3.1) arises as energy minimizers subject to conservations of the momentum and the mass, generalizing ground states in the solitary wave setting.

Proposition 3.2 (Existence, symmetry and regularity)**.** *Let* $1/3 < \alpha \leqslant 2$.

A minimizer u *for* H *subject to that* P *and* M *are conserved exists in* $H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ *for each* $0 < T < \infty$ *and it satisfies* (3.8) *for some* $c \neq 0$ *and* $a \in \mathbb{R}$. *Furthermore it depends upon* c *and* a *in the* C^1 *manner.*

Moreover $u(\cdot\,; c, a)$ *is even and strictly decreasing over the interval* $[0, T/2]$, *and* $u(\cdot\,; c, a) \in H^\infty_{per}([0,T])$.

In other words, a family of energy minimizers for (3.8) under constraints satisfies Assumption 2.2.

Proof. It suffices to take $a = 0$. For, otherwise, we may assume that c and M are of opposite sign and $a \geqslant 0$. In case c and M are of the same sign, noting that (3.1) is time reversible, $t \mapsto -t$ in (3.1) switches the sign of c in (3.8) while leaving other components of the equation invariant. Once we accomplish that c and M are of opposite sign, $a \geqslant 0$ in view of (3.10) since $P \geqslant 0$ and $T > 0$ by definition. We then devise the change of variables $u \mapsto u + \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{c^2+4a} - c)$ and rewrite (3.8) as

$$\Lambda^\alpha u - u^2 + \gamma u = 0, \qquad \text{where } \gamma = \sqrt{c^2+4a} > 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Incidentally this is reminiscent of that (3.1) enjoys the Galilean invariance under $u(x,t) \mapsto u(x-\lambda t, t)+\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. To recapitulate, it suffices to take $a=0$ (and $c>0$) and seek a minimizer for H subject to constant P.

Since $H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ in the range $\alpha>1/3$ is compactly embedded in $L^3_{per}([0,T])$ by a Sobolev inequality, it is standard from calculus of variations that the minimization problem

$$E_1 = \inf\big\{H(u)+P(u) : u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])\big\}$$

is attained, say, at $u_1 \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ and u_1 satisfies (3.15) with $\gamma=1$ in the sense of distributions. The proof is rudimentary and hence we omit the detail. Thanks to the scaling invariance (3.7), moreover, the constrained minimization problem with parameter (abusing notation) $P>0$,

$$E = \inf\{H(u) : u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T]),\ P(u)=P\}$$

is attained at $u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ if and only if $u(x)=\lambda^{\alpha/2}u_1(\lambda x)$ for some constant $\lambda>0$ chosen to ensure that $P(u)=P$. Clearly u satisfies (3.15) for some $\gamma>0$ in the sense of distributions. The existence assertion therefore follows. It is standard from calculus of variations that u depends upon γ and, in turn, c and a in the C^1 manner.

To proceed, since the symmetric decreasing rearrangement of u strictly decreases $\int_0^T u\Lambda^\alpha u\,dx$ for $0<\alpha\leqslant 2$ while leaving $\int_0^T u^3\,dx$ invariant, it follows from standard rearrangement arguments that a minimizer for H subject to conservations of P and M must symmetrically decrease away from the principal elevation. The symmetry and monotonicity assertion therefore follows. (Notice that unlike in the solitary waves setting, where $a=0$ and $T=\infty$ simultaneously, a periodic energy minimizer under constraints needs not be positive everywhere.)

It remains to address the smoothness of a periodic solution of (3.8), or equivalently,

$$u = (\Lambda^\alpha+1)^{-1}u^2 \tag{3.16}$$

after reduction to $a=0$, $c=1$ and after inversion. We claim that if $u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ satisfies (3.16) then $u \in L^\infty_{per}([0,T])$. In the case of $\alpha>1$ this follows from a Sobolev inequality, while in the case of $1/3<\alpha\leqslant 1$ a proof based upon bounds for the resolvant $(\Lambda^\alpha+1)^{-1}$ is found in [FL12, Lemma A.3], for instance, in the solitary wave setting. Specifically $\widehat{\frac{1}{|\xi|^\alpha+1}} \in L^r_{per}([0,T])$ for $0<\alpha<1$ for $r>\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, whence $u\in L^\infty_{per}([0,T])$ after iterating (3.16) sufficiently many times.

We then promote $u \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T]) \cap L^\infty_{per}([0,T])$ to $H^\alpha_{per}([0,T])$, since the Plancherel theorem and Young's inequality in the Fourier space manifest that

$$\|\Lambda^\alpha u\|_{L^2} = \Big\|\frac{\Lambda^\alpha}{\Lambda^\alpha+1}u^2\Big\|_{L^2} = \Big\|\frac{|\xi|^\alpha}{|\xi|^\alpha+1}\hat{u}*\hat{u}\Big\|_{L^2} \leqslant C\|\hat{u}\|_{L^1}\|\hat{u}\|_{L^2} \leqslant C\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{L^2} < \infty.$$

Here and elsewhere, C means a positive generic constant. Similarly

$$\|\Lambda^{2\alpha}u\|_{L^2} = \Big\|\frac{\Lambda^{2\alpha}}{\Lambda^\alpha+1}u^2\Big\|_{L^2} \leqslant C\|\hat{u}\|_{L^1}\||\xi|^\alpha\hat{u}\|_{L^2} \leqslant C\|u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^\alpha u\|_{L^2} < \infty,$$

and $u \in H^\infty_{per}([0,T])$ follows successively. □

Remark 3.3 (Power-law nonlinearities)**.** One may rerun the arguments in the proof of Proposition 3.2 in the case of the general power-law nonlinearity

$$u_t - \Lambda^\alpha u_x + (u^{p+1})_x = 0 \tag{3.17}$$

and obtains a family of periodic traveling waves, where $0 < \alpha \leqslant 2$ and $0 < p < p_{max}$ is an integer,

$$p_{max} := \begin{cases} \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha < 1, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \alpha \geqslant 1. \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

Indeed they minimize in $H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ the Hamiltonian

$$\int_0^T \Big(\frac{1}{2}u\Lambda^\alpha u - \frac{1}{p+2}u^{p+2}\Big)\,dx$$

subject to that P and M in (3.4) and (3.5), respectively, are conserved. Note that $0 < p < p_{max}$ guarantees that (3.17) is $H^{\alpha/2}$-subcritical so that $H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T]) \subset L^{p+2}_{per}([0,T])$ compactly. In case $p = 1$, it is equivalent to $\alpha > 1/3$.

Remark 3.4 (Periodic vs. solitary waves)**.** In the non-periodic setting, Weinstein in [Wei87] (see also [FL12]) demonstrated that (3.8) in the range $\alpha > 1/3$ admits a solitary wave, for which $a = 0$ and $T = \infty$ simultaneously, by seeking an optimizer in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R})$ for the Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequality

$$\Big(\int |u|^3\Big)^{2\alpha} \leqslant C\Big(\int u\Lambda^\alpha u\Big)\Big(\int u^2\Big)^{(\alpha-1)+2\alpha}. \tag{3.19}$$

If $\alpha > 1/2$ so that (3.8) is L^2-subcritical, in addition, the solitary wave further arises as a minimizer for the Hamiltonian subject to constant momentum and periodic constrained minimizers for (3.8), constructed via Proposition 3.2, are expected to tend to the solitary wave as the period increases to infinity. If $1/3 < \alpha < 1/2$, on the other hand, constrained energy minimizers, while they exist in the periodic wave setting, are unlikely to attain a limiting state with bounded energy (the $H^{\alpha/2}$-norm) at the solitary wave limit. Instead the arguments in [Wei87] will lead to a family of periodic traveling waves of (3.1) that each optimizes (3.19) among mean zero functions and which are expected to converge to the solitary wave, obtained in [Wei87], as the period increases to infinity.

One is able to construct periodic traveling waves of (3.1), where $\alpha \geqslant -1$, at least for small amplitudes, via a perturbative method, e.g., local bifurcation theory. In the solitary wave setting, in contrast, Pohozaev identities techniques dictate that (3.8) for $\alpha \leqslant 1/3$ does not admit any nontrivial solutions in $H^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^3(\mathbb{R})$.

3.2. **Nondegeneracies.**

Throughout the subsection let $u(\cdot\,; c, a)$ be a periodic traveling wave of (3.1), whose existence follows from Proposition 3.2. We shall address Assumption 2.5.

Clearly $u(\cdot\,; c, a)$ satisfies (N1) of Assumption 2.5.

Proposition 3.5 (Nondegeneracy of the linearization)**.** *Let* $1/3 < \alpha \leqslant 2$.

If $u(\cdot\,; c, a) \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T])$ *for some* $c \neq 0$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ *and for some* $T > 0$ *minimizes* H *subject to that* P *and* M *are conserved then the associated linearized operator*

$$\delta^2 E(u; c, a) = \Lambda^\alpha - 2u - c \tag{3.20}$$

acting on $L^2_{per}([0,T])$ *is nondegenerate. That is to say,*

$$\ker(\delta^2 E(u;c,a)) = \mathrm{span}\{u_x\}.$$

In other words, $u(\cdot\,;c,a)$ satisfies (N2) of Assumption 2.5.

The nondegeneracy of the linearization is of fundamental importance in the stability of traveling waves and in the blowup analysis for the related, time evolution equation; see [Wei87,Lin08,KMR11] among others. But to establish the property is far from being trivial, though. As a matter of fact, one may cook up a polynomial nonlinearity, say, $f(u)$ so that the kernel of $-\partial_x^2 - f'(u)$ at the underlying wave is two dimensional at isolated points.

In the case of (local) generalized KdV equations (see (2.9)), the nondegeneracy of the linearization at a periodic traveling wave was shown in [BJ10] to be equivalent to that the wave amplitude not be a critical point of the period, by means of the Sturm-Liouville oscillation theorems for ODEs; it was similarly verified in [Kwo89], among others, at ground states. Amick and Toland [AT91] elucidated the property for the Benjamin-Ono equation, both in the periodic and solitary wave settings, relating the nonlocal traveling wave equation to a fully nonlinear ODE via complex analysis techniques; unfortunately, their arguments are extremely specific to the Benjamin-Ono equation. Angulo Pava and Natali [APN08] made an alternative proof based upon the theory of totally positive operators, which however necessitates an explicit form of the solution. A satisfactory understanding of the nondegeneracy of the linearization therefore seems largely missing in the case of nonlocal equations. The main obstruction is that shooting arguments and other ODE techniques may not be applicable to nonlocal operators.

Nevertheless, Frank and Lenzmann [FL12] recently demonstrated the property at ground states for a class of nonlinear nonlocal equations with fractional derivatives. Their idea lies in to find a suitable substitute for the Sturm-Liouville theory to count the number of sign changes in eigenfunctions of the associated linearized operator. Our proof of Proposition 3.5 follows along the same line as the arguments in [FL12, Section 3], but with appropriate modifications to accommodate the periodic nature of the problem.

Lemma 3.6 (Oscillation of eigenfunctions)**.** *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 3.5 an eigenfunction in* $H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0,T]) \cap C^0_{per}([0,T])$ *corresponding to the* j*-th eigenvalue of* $\delta^2 E$ *changes its sign at most* j *times over the periodic interval* $[0,T]$.

The regularity of eigenfunctions follows from the last part of Proposition 3.2; see also [FL12]. A thorough proof of Lemma 3.6 may be found in [FL12] in the solitary wave setting. Here we merely hit the main points.

Notice that Λ^α, $0<\alpha<2$, may be viewed as the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator for an appropriate (local) elliptic problem set in the periodic half strip $[0,T]_{per} \times [0,\infty)$. Specifically

$$C(\alpha)\Lambda^\alpha u = \lim_{y\to 0+} y^{1-\alpha} w_y(\cdot, y),$$

where w solves the elliptic boundary value problem

$$\Delta w + \frac{1-\alpha}{y} w_y = 0 \quad \text{in } [0,T]_{per} \times (0,\infty), \qquad w = u \quad \text{on } [0,T]_{per} \times \{0\}$$

and $C(\alpha)$ is an explicit constant. Accordingly one derives a variational characterization of (eigenvalues and) eigenfunctions of (3.20) in terms of the Dirichlet type functional

$$\iint_{[0,T]_{per}\times(0,\infty)} |\nabla w(x,y)|^2 y^{1-\alpha}\ dxdy + \int_0^T (-2u(x)-c)|w(x,0)|^2\ dx$$

in a suitable function class. The assertion then follows from nodal domain bounds a la Courant.

Below we gather some, mostly elementary, facts about $\delta^2 E$.

Lemma 3.7 (Properties of $\delta^2 E$)**.** *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 3.5 the followings hold:*

- (L1) $u_x \in \ker(\delta^2 E)$*; moreover it corresponds to the lowest eigenvalue of* $\delta^2 E$ *restricted to the sector of odd functions in* $L^2_{per}([0,T])$*;*
- (L2) $n_-(\delta^2 E) \leqslant 2$*, where* $n_-(\delta^2 E)$ *denotes the number of negative eigenvalues of* $\delta^2 E$ *acting on* $L^2_{per}([0,T])$*, namely the Morse index;*
- (L3) $1, u \in \mathrm{range}(\delta^2 E)$.

Proof. Differentiating (3.8) implies that $\delta^2 E u_x = 0$. Moreover Proposition 3.2 implies that u may be chosen to satisfy $u_x(x) < 0$ for $0 < x < T/2$. On the other hand, the lowest eigenvalue of $\delta^2 E$ acting on $L^2_{per,odd}([0,T])$ must be simple and the corresponding eigenfunction must be strictly positive over the interval $[0,T/2]$; the proof of such a Perron-Frobenious property is rudimentary and hence we omit the detail. Therefore zero is the lowest eigenvalue of $\delta^2 E$ restricted to $L^2_{per,odd}([0,T])$ and u_x is a corresponding eigenfunction.

Since u is a minimizer for H, and in turn E, subject to conservations of P and M, necessarily,

$$\delta^2 E|_{\{\delta P(u),\delta M(u)\}^\perp} \geqslant 0. \tag{3.21}$$

This implies by Courant's mini-max principle that $\delta^2 E$ admits at most two negative eigenvalues, asserting (L2). (Unlike in the solitary wave setting, where $n_-(\delta^2 E) = 1$ at a ground state, $\delta^2 E$ may have up to two negative directions in the periodic wave setting. We will characterize this in Remark 3.8 below.)

Lastly, (2.5c), (2.5b) and (3.6) verify (L3). □

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Making the orthogonal decomposition

$$L^2_{per}([0,T]) = L^2_{per,odd}([0,T]) \oplus L^2_{per,even}([0,T]),$$

since u may be chosen to be even thanks to Proposition 3.2, we find that $L^2_{per,odd}([0,T])$ and $L^2_{per,even}([0,T])$ are invariant subspaces of $\delta^2 E$. Moreover (L1) of Lemma 3.7 implies that

$$\ker(\delta^2 E|_{L^2_{per,odd}([0,T])}) = \mathrm{span}\{u_x\}.$$

It remains to show that $\ker(\delta^2 E|_{L^2_{per,even}([0,T])}) = \{0\}$.

Suppose on the contrary that there were a nontrivial function $\phi \in L^2_{per,even}([0,T])$ such that $\delta^2 E\phi = 0$. Since $\delta^2 E$ has at most two negative eigenvalues by (L2) of Lemma 3.7, it follows by Lemma 3.6 that ϕ changes its sign at most twice over the periodic interval $[0,T]$. Consequently either ϕ is positive throughout $[0,T]$, or there exists $T_1 \in (0,T/2)$ such that ϕ is positive for $|x| < T_1$ and negative for $x \in (-T/2,T_1) \cup (T_1,T/2)$. Since ϕ is in the kernel of $\delta^2 E$, on the other hand, it must be orthogonal to range($\delta^2 E$), and in turn to the subspace span$\{1, u\}$ by (L3) of Lemma 3.7. In particular

$$\langle \phi, \sigma u - \tau \rangle = 0 \qquad \text{for all} \quad \sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Taking $\sigma = 0$ and $\tau = -1$ we find that ϕ cannot be positive throughout $[0, T]$. In case ϕ changes signs at $x = \pm T_1$, noting that u is symmetrically decreasing away from the origin over the interval $(-T/2, T/2)$, we may choose $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $u - \tau$ is positive in $(-T_1, T_1)$ and negative in $(-T/2, -T_1) \cup (T_1, T/2)$, deducing that ϕ cannot be orthogonal to $\{1, u\}$. A contradiction therefore asserts that the kernel of $\delta^2 E$ must consist merely of u_x. □

One may repeat the arguments in the proof of Proposition 3.5 mutatis mutandis to verify the nondegeneracy of the linearization associated with (3.17) at a periodic energy minimizer under constraints, in the range $0 < \alpha \leqslant 2$ and $0 < p < p_{max}$, where p_{max} is in (3.18).

One may verify (N2) of Assumption 2.5 at a periodic traveling wave of (3.1), $\alpha \geqslant -1$, for small amplitudes, that follows from, e.g., a local bifurcation theorem from a simple eigenvalue, by explicitly calculating the asymptotic expansion of the solution.

Remark 3.8 (The Morse index)**.** We make a digression and characterize $n_-(\delta^2 E)$ at a periodic energy minimizer for (3.8) under constraints. We begin by recalling an index formula.

Lemma 3.9 (An index formula)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a self-adjoint operator, bounded below and invertible with compact resolvant. Let S be a finite-dimensional subspace of the domain of $\mathcal{K}$ and let $\mathcal{K}|_S$ denote the* symmetric *restriction of $\mathcal{K}$ to S. That is to say, $\mathcal{K}|_S = \Pi_S \mathcal{K} \Pi_S$, where Π_S is the orthogonal projection onto S. Then*

$$n_-(\mathcal{K}) = n_-(\mathcal{K}|_S) + n_-(\mathcal{K}^{-1}|_{S^\perp}). \tag{3.22}$$

This explains that the inertia of a matrix is linear under the Schur complement. Various forms of (3.22) are known in the nonlinear waves community; see [KP12, CPV05, GSS87], for instance. See also [Hay68] for discussion in finite dimensions. We include a proof in Appendix A for completeness.

We are going to restrict the attention to the orthogonal complement of u_x, which contains 1 and u. Since u_x lies in the kernel of $\delta^2 E$, such restriction does not change $n_-(\delta^2 E)$. Moreover $\delta^2 E$ is invertible on $\{u_x\}^\perp$. Taking $S = \{1, u\}^\perp$ we apply (3.22) and write that

$$n_-(\delta^2 E) = n_-(\delta^2 E|_{\{1,u\}^\perp}) + n_-((\delta^2 E)^{-1}|_{\{1,u\}}).$$

Note from (3.21) that $n_-(\delta^2 E|_{\{1,u\}^\perp}) = 0$. Moreover note from (2.5c) and (2.5b) that $(\delta^2 E)^{-1} 1 = u_a$ and $(\delta^2 E)^{-1} u = u_c$, where 1 and u are in general not orthogonal but by Sylvester's law of inertia,

$$n_-\left((\delta^2 E)^{-1}|_{\{1,u\}}\right) = n_- \begin{pmatrix} \langle 1, u_a \rangle & \langle 1, u_c \rangle \\ \langle u, u_a \rangle & \langle u, u_c \rangle \end{pmatrix} = n_- \begin{pmatrix} M_a & M_c \\ P_a & P_c \end{pmatrix}.$$

A Sturm sequence argument then leads to that

$$n_-(\delta^2 E) = \#\text{ sign changes in } 1, M_a, M_a P_c - M_c P_a. \tag{3.23}$$

This furnishes an alternative characterization of $n_-(\delta^2 E)$. It is particularly useful in practice since the signs of M_a and $G = M_c P_a - M_a P_c$ may be explicitly determined in the solitary wave limit (see Lemma 3.10 below) and in the small amplitude wave limit, as well as for ODEs.

Since $u_x(0) = 0$ and $u_x(0) < 0$ for $0 < x < T/2$ by Proposition 3.2, a Perron-Frobenious argument asserts that $\delta^2 E$ must admit at least one negative eigenvalue that lies in $L^2_{per,even}([0, T])$. Therefore $\begin{pmatrix} M_a & M_c \\ P_a & P_c \end{pmatrix}$ cannot be positive definite.

We turn the attention to (N3) of Assumption 2.5.

Lemma 3.10 (Nondegeneracy of the constraint set)**.** *Let* $1/2 < \alpha \leqslant 2$.

If $u(\cdot\,; c, a) \in H^{\alpha/2}_{per}([0, T])$ *for some* $c \neq 0$*,* $a \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $T > 0$ *minimizes* H *subject to that* P *and* M *are conserved then* $M_a < 0$ *and* $G > 0$ *for* $|a|$ *sufficiently small and* T *sufficiently large.*

Proof. Noting that the period $T > 0$ is arbitrary in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we recall from Remark 3.4 that $u(\cdot\,; c, a, T)$ tends to the solitary wave of (3.1) in the solitary wave limit, as $a \to 0$ and $T \to \infty$ simultaneously. Thanks to the scaling invariance (3.7), we may assume without loss of generality that $c = 1$. Indeed (3.8) remains invariant under

$$u(\cdot\,; c, a, T) \mapsto c^{-1}u(\cdot\,; 1, c^{-2}a, c^{-1/\alpha}T).$$

Accordingly

$$P(1, a, T), M(1, a, T), P_c(1, a, T), M_c(1, a, T) = O(1)$$

for $|a|$ sufficiently small and $T > 0$ sufficiently large. Differentiating (3.10) with respect to a and evaluating at the solitary wave limit, we use (2.6) to find that

$$M_a = -T - 2M_c = -T + O(1) < 0$$

for T sufficiently large. Since an explicit calculation reveals that $P_c(u(\cdot\,; c, a, T)) > 0$ for $|a|$ sufficiently small and T sufficiently large, it follows that

$$G = M_c^2 - M_a P_c = P_c T + O(1) > 0$$

near the solitary wave limit. □

In case $\alpha \leqslant 1/2$ so that (3.8) is L^2-supercritical, periodic energy minimizers under constraints are not expected to attain a limiting state as $a \to 0$ and $T \to \infty$ simultaneously, with bounded energy (the $H^{\alpha/2}$-norm). Nevertheless one may verify (N3) of Assumption 2.5 at least at small amplitude waves, constructed via a local bifurcation theorem, by explicitly calculating the asymptotics of the solution.

3.3. **Calculation of the modulational instability index.**

Let $u(\cdot + x_0; c, a, T)$ be a T-periodic, traveling wave solution of (3.1), satisfying that

$$\Lambda^\alpha u - u^2 - cu - a = 0, \tag{3.24}$$

whose existence follows either from Proposition 3.2 or via local bifurcation theory. Let u satisfy Assumption 2.2 and Assumption 2.5. We shall take the approach in Section 2 to studying the associated spectral problem

$$\mu v = L_0(u; c, a)v := \partial_x(\Lambda^\alpha - 2u - c)v \tag{3.25}$$

and determine an instability with respect to long wavelengths perturbations. Specifically we shall determine the modulational instability index Δ in (2.31) in terms of U, P, M as functions of c and a. Incidentally U, P, M correspond to the third, the second and the first momenta, respectively. We may restate the result in terms of H, P, M, noting from (3.2) and (3.11) that

$$K = 3H - 2cP - aM \quad \text{and} \quad U = -2H + 2cP + aM.$$

In the forthcoming section we shall determine the modulational instability index in the case of the general nonlinearity, in terms of K and U, P, M together with their derivatives with respect to c, a as well as T^{-1}.

We may invoke the results of Corollary 2.8 to express the modulational instability index in terms of various inner products between

$$v_1 = u_a, \qquad w_1 = M_c u - P_c, \tag{3.26a}$$

$$v_2 = u_x, \qquad w_2 = \partial_x^{-1}(M_a u_c - M_c u_a), \tag{3.26b}$$

$$v_3 = u_c, \qquad w_3 = P_a - M_a u \tag{3.26c}$$

as well as L_0^{-1} and

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(u;c,a) =& [L_0, x] = (\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha - 2u - c, \\ L_2(u;c,a) =& [L_1, x] = \alpha(\alpha+1)\Lambda^{\alpha-2}\partial_x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Notice that

$$\langle v_j, w_k\rangle = \{M, P\}_{c,a}\delta_{jk} = G\delta_{jk},$$

where we recall the notation

$$\{f, g\}_{x,y} = f_x g_y - f_y g_x$$

and that $\delta_{jk} = 1$ if $j = k$, $\delta_{jk} = 0$ otherwise.

We begin by rewriting $\langle w_j, L_1 v_k\rangle$, $j, k = 1, 2, 3$, in terms of U, P, M. In view of (3.27) we use (3.12) and (3.24) to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 u = (\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha u - 2u^2 - cu =& (\alpha+1)\delta K + 2\delta U - c\delta P = -\delta W \\ =& (1-\alpha)\delta U + \alpha c\delta P + (\alpha+1)a\delta M \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

and

$$L_1 1 = (\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha 1 - 2u - c = -(2\delta P + c\delta M). \tag{3.29}$$

Since L_1 is self-adjoint, we use (3.26a) and (3.28), (3.29) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_1, L_1 v_1\rangle =& \langle L_1 w_1, v_1\rangle \\ =& M_c((1-\alpha)U_a + \alpha c P_a + (\alpha+1)aM_a) + P_c(2P_a + cM_a). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30a}$$

Similarly,

$$\langle w_1, L_1 v_3\rangle = \quad M_c((1-\alpha)U_c + \alpha c P_c + (\alpha+1)aM_c) + P_c(2P_c + cM_c), \tag{3.30b}$$

$$\langle w_3, L_1 v_1\rangle = - M_a((1-\alpha)U_a + \alpha c P_a + (\alpha+1)aM_a) - P_a(2P_a + cM_a), \tag{3.30c}$$

$$\langle w_3, L_1 v_3\rangle = - M_a((1-\alpha)U_c + \alpha c P_c + (\alpha+1)aM_c) - P_a(2P_c + cM_c). \tag{3.30d}$$

Therefore

$$\langle w_1, L_1 v_1\rangle + \langle w_3, L_1 v_3\rangle = (1-\alpha)(\{M, U\}_{c,a} - cG). \tag{3.31}$$

Moreover we use (3.26b) to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_2, L_1v_2\rangle =&\langle \partial_x^{-1}(M_au_c - M_cu_a), L_1u_x\rangle\\ =&\langle \partial_x^{-1}(M_au_c - M_cu_a), \partial_x((\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha - u - c)u\rangle\\ =&-\langle M_au_c - M_cu_a, -\alpha\delta U + \alpha c\delta P + (\alpha+1)a\delta M\rangle\\ =&-\alpha(\{M,U\}_{c,a} - cG).\end{aligned}\tag{3.32}$$

Therefore, we calculate in view of (2.30a) that

$$D_2 = \boxed{G^2(1-2\alpha)(\{M,U\}_{c,a} - cG)}.\tag{3.33}$$

Calculations of c_{22} and c_{32} in (2.25c) and (2.25h) are involved. As a preliminary, we combine a periodic Pohozaev-type identity and the scaling invariance to express $L_0^{-1}L_1v_2$ in a convenient form.

Lemma 3.11. *It follows that*

$$L_0^{-1}L_1v_2 = -\alpha u + G^{-1}\langle w_2, L_1v_2\rangle v_3 + \alpha G^{-1}(\langle w_1, u\rangle v_1 + \langle w_3, u\rangle v_3)\tag{3.34a}$$

$$= -\alpha u + \alpha G^{-1}(2M_cP - P_cM)v_1 - \alpha c v_3.\tag{3.34b}$$

Proof. Note from the scaling invariance (3.7) that if $u(x;c,a,T)$ satisfies (3.8) then so does $\lambda^\alpha u(\lambda x;\lambda^\alpha c, \lambda^{2\alpha}a, \lambda T)$ for any $\lambda > 0$. Differentiating

$$\delta E(\lambda^\alpha u(\lambda x;\lambda^\alpha c, \lambda^{2\alpha}a, \lambda T)) = 0$$

with respect to λ and evaluating at $\lambda = 1$ we obtain that

$$\delta^2 E(\alpha u + xu_x + \alpha c u_c + 2\alpha a u_a + Tu_T) = 0.$$

In other words, $\alpha u + 2\alpha a u_a + \alpha c u_c + xu_x + Tu_T$ is in the kernel of $\delta^2 E$. The result of Proposition 3.5, on the other hand, states that $\ker(\delta^2 E)$ is one-dimensional and spanned merely by u_x, which is odd. Since $\alpha u + 2\alpha a u_a + \alpha c u_c + xu_x + Tu_T$ is even, it must be zero. To summarize, $xu_x + Tu_T = -\alpha(u + 2au_a + cu_c)$.

Therefore, we infer from (2.32) that

$$L_1v_2 = L_0(-\alpha(u + 2av_1 + cv_3)).$$

Consequently

$$L_0^{-1}L_1v_2 = -\alpha u + c_1v_1 + c_3v_3$$

for some $c_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ a constant and $c_3 = -\alpha c$. Indeed, $\ker(L_0) = \text{span}\{v_1, v_2\}$ but v_2 is odd. Taking inner products against w_1 and w_3 then leads to that

$$0 = -\alpha\langle w_1, u\rangle + c_1G \quad\text{and}\quad \langle w_2, L_1v_2\rangle = -\alpha\langle w_3, u\rangle + c_3G.\tag{3.35}$$

Therefore (3.34a) follows. Moreover (3.34b) follows, noting that

$$\langle w_1, u\rangle = 2M_cP - P_cM \quad\text{and}\quad \langle w_3, u\rangle = P_aM - 2M_aP.$$

□

In the case of the general power-law nonlinearity (see (3.17)) the equation enjoys a scaling invariance, and one may repeat the proof of Lemma 3.11 mutatis mutandis to calculate $L_0^{-1}L_1v_2$ in the form (3.34a).

Incidentally, the latter equation in (3.35) offers with the assistance of (3.32) that $\{M,U\}_{c,a} = 2cG + P_aM - 2M_aP$.

Introducing

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V =&\alpha L_1 u+\frac{1}{2}L_2 u_x=\alpha\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\alpha+1)\Lambda^{\alpha}u-2u^2-cu\Big)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\alpha((\alpha-3)u^2+(\alpha-1)cu+(\alpha+1)a),\end{aligned}\tag{3.36}$$

we use (3.34a) to revamp c_{22} in (2.25c) as

$$\begin{aligned}c_{22} =&\langle w_1,\alpha L_1 u\rangle-G^{-1}\langle w_1,L_1\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle v_3\rangle\\ &-\alpha G^{-1}\langle w_1,L_1(\langle w_1,u\rangle v_1+\langle w_3,u\rangle v_3)\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle w_1,L_2v_2\rangle\\ =&-G^{-1}\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle+d_{22},\end{aligned}\tag{3.37}$$

where a straightforward calculation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned}d_{22}:=&\langle w_1,\delta V\rangle-\alpha G^{-1}\left(\langle w_1,u\rangle\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle+\langle w_3,u\rangle\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle\right)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\alpha(M_c(3(3-\alpha)U+2(\alpha-1)cP+(\alpha+1)aM)\\ &\qquad-P_c(2(\alpha-3)P+(\alpha-1)cM+(\alpha+1)a))\\ &-\alpha(1-\alpha)G^{-1}(2M_cP\{M,U\}_{c,a}-M_cM\{P,U\}_{c,a})\\ &-\alpha(2\alpha cM_cP+4P_cP+(\alpha+1)\alpha aM_cM+cP_cM).\end{aligned}\tag{3.38}$$

Correspondingly

$$c_{32}:=-G^{-1}\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle+d_{32},\tag{3.39}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}d_{32}:=&\langle w_3,\delta V\rangle-\alpha G^{-1}\left(\langle w_1,u\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle+\langle w_3,u\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle\right)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\alpha(P_a(2(\alpha-3)P+(\alpha-1)cM+(\alpha+1)a)\\ &\qquad-2M_a(3(3-\alpha)U+2(\alpha-1)cP+(\alpha+1)aM))\\ &+\alpha(1-\alpha)G^{-1}(2M_aP\{M,U\}_{c,a}-M_aM\{P,U\}_{c,a})\\ &+\alpha(2\alpha cM_aP+4P_aP+(\alpha+1)\alpha aM_aM+cP_aM).\end{aligned}\tag{3.40}$$

Since a straightforward calculation reveals that

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle-\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle\\ &=(1-\alpha)G(2\{P,U\}_{c,a}+c\{M,U\}_{c,a})-G(2(\alpha+1)a-\alpha c^2)=:\Gamma,\end{aligned}\tag{3.41}$$

we use (3.37), (3.39) and calculate in view of (2.30b), (2.30c) that

$$\begin{aligned}D_1 =&G(\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle-\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle\\ &\quad-\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle\left(\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle+\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle\right)-Gd_{32})\\ =&\boxed{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\{M,U\}_{c,a}-cG)^2+G(\Gamma-d_{32})}\end{aligned}\tag{3.42}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}D_0 =&\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle(\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle-\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle)\\ &+G(\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle d_{22}-\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle d_{32})\\ =&\boxed{\alpha\Gamma(\{M,U\}_{c,a}-cG)+G(\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle d_{22}-\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle d_{32})},\end{aligned}\tag{3.43}$$

where $\langle w_1, L_1 v_1\rangle$, $w_3, L_1 v_1\rangle$ and d_{22}, d_{32} are specified in (3.30a), (3.30c) and (3.38), (3.40), respectively, in terms of U, P, M as functions of c, a.

To summarize, the modulational instability index for a periodic traveling wave of (3.1) is calculated as the discriminant of the cubic polynomial

$$\det(\mathbf{D} - \mu G\mathbf{I}) = -G^3\mu^3 + D_2\mu^2 + D_1\mu + D_0,$$

where D_2, D_1, D_0 are specified in (3.33), (3.42), (3.43), respectively, in terms of U, P, M as functions of c, a.

Notice that the characteristic polynomial may be further written with the help of Lemma 3.11 as

$$\det(\mathbf{D} - \mu G\mathbf{I}) = \begin{vmatrix} \langle w_3, L_1 v_3\rangle - G\mu & Gd_{32} & \langle w_3, L_1 v_1\rangle \\ 1 & \langle w_2, L_1 v_2\rangle - G\mu & 0 \\ \langle w_1, L_1 v_3\rangle & Gd_{22} & \langle w_1, L1 v_1\rangle - G\mu \end{vmatrix}. \tag{3.44}$$

One may repeat the arguments leading to (3.43) or (3.44) mutatis mutandis to determine the spectral stability near the origin of a periodic traveling wave of (3.17) to long wavelengths perturbations.

4. APPLICATION: GENERAL NONLINEARITIES

We shall discuss how the developments in Section 2 and Section 3 may be adapted to the generalized KdV equation with fractional dispersion

$$u_t - \Lambda^\alpha u_x + f(u)_x = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

where $0 < \alpha \leqslant 2$ and f is a smooth nonlinearity.

Notice that (4.1) possesses three conserved quantities (abusing notation)

$$H(u) = \int_0^T \Big(\frac{1}{2}u\Lambda^\alpha u - F(u)\Big)\,dx =: K(u) + U(u), \tag{4.2}$$

where $F' = f$, and

$$P(u) = \int_0^T \frac{1}{2}u^2\,dx, \tag{4.3}$$

$$M(u) = \int_0^T u\,dx, \tag{4.4}$$

which correspond to the Hamiltonian and the momentum, the mass, respectively. We refer to K and U as the kinetic energy and the potential energy, respectively. Throughout the section we will use H, K, U and P, M for those in (4.2) and (4.3), (4.4), respectively. Obviously (4.1) is in the Hamiltonian form (2.1), where $J = \partial_x$. Notice that H, P, M are smooth in an appropriate subspace of $H^\alpha_{per}([0,T])$ and translationally invariant. Thanks to (3.6), hence, H, P, M satisfy Assumption 2.1.

Assume that (4.1) admits a smooth, four-parameter family of periodic traveling waves, denoted $u(\cdot + x_0; c, a, T)$, where c and a form an open set in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $T > 0$ are arbitrary, and where u is even and T-periodic, satisfying by quadrature that

$$\Lambda^\alpha u - f(u) - cu - a = 0 \tag{4.5}$$

for some c and a (in the sense of distributions). Or equivalently, it satisfies (abusing notation) that

$$\delta E(u;c,a) := \delta(K(u)+U(u)-cP(u)-aM(u))=0. \tag{4.6}$$

For a broad range of nonlinearities, the existence of periodic traveling waves of (4.1) usually follows from variational arguments, e.g., the mountain pass theorem applied to a suitable variational problem whose Euler-Lagrange equation is (4.5). We shall determine the spectral instability of $u(\cdot+x_0;c,a,T)$ near the origin with respect to long wavelengths perturbations. We assume that it satisfies Assumption 2.5.

One may follow the arguments leading to the results in Corollary 2.8 and derive the modulational instability index Δ in (2.31) in terms of various inner products between (abusing notation)

$$\begin{aligned} v_1&=u_a, & w_1&=M_cu-P_c,\\ v_2&=u_x, & w_2&=\partial_x^{-1}(M_au_c-M_cu_a),\\ v_3&=u_c, & w_3&=P_a-M_au, \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$L_0 =\partial_x(\Lambda^\alpha-f'(u)-c), \tag{4.7a}$$

$$L_1 =(\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha-f'(u)-c, \tag{4.7b}$$

$$L_2 =\alpha(\alpha+1)\Lambda^{\alpha-2}\partial_x. \tag{4.7c}$$

We shall further express inner products in terms of K and U, P, M together with their derivatives with respect to c, a as well as $\Omega=1/T$. Below we develop integral identities that a periodic solution of (4.5), or equivalently (4.6), a priori satisfies and which will be useful in various proofs.

Lemma 4.1 (Integral identities). *If u satisfies (4.5) (in the sense of distributions) then*

$$\int_0^T f(u)\ dx\ +cM+aT=0, \tag{4.8}$$

$$2K-\int_0^T uf(u)\ dx-2cP-aM=0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$(\alpha-1)K-\int_0^T F(u)\ dx\ +cP+aM+TE_T=0. \tag{4.10}$$

Multiplying (4.5) by 1, u and xu_x+Tu_T, respectively, and integrating over $[0,T]$, the proof is very similar to that of Lemma 3.1. Hence we omit the detail.

In the case of power-law nonlinearities, $uf(u)$ and $F(u)$ are proportional, whereby one may relate the kinetic energy, for instance, to the potential energy and the momentum, the mass. See the previous section. In the case of general nonlinearities, where scaling invariance is lost, on the other hand, the kinetic and the potential energies and the momentum, the mass are no longer linearly dependent and the modulational instability index will involve K and U, P, M. Furthermore derivatives with respect to c, a and T are not linearly dependent. Therefore the stability index will involve K, U, P, M together with their derivatives with respect to c, a, T^{-1}.

We shall rewrite $\langle w_j, L_1 v_k\rangle$, where $j,k=1,2,3$ and $j+k$ is odd, in terms of K and U,P,M as functions of c,a and T. Note that

$$L_1u=(\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha u-f'(u)-cu \quad\text{and}\quad L_11=-f'(u)-c.$$

Differentiating (4.9) and (4.8) with respect to a we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}2K_a+U_a-&\int_0^T uf'(u)u_a\;dx-2cP_a-(aM)_a\\ &=K_a+E_a-\int_0^T uf'(u)u_a\;dx-cP_a=0,\end{aligned}$$

where we recall from (4.6) that $E=K+U-cP-aM$, and

$$\int_0^T f'(u)u_a\;dx+cM_a+T=0,$$

respectively. Since L_1 is self-adjoint, we then calculate that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_1,L_1v_1\rangle =&\langle L_1w_1,v_1\rangle=M_c\langle L_1u,u_a\rangle-P_c\langle L_11,u_a\rangle\\ =&M_c((\alpha+1)K_a-K_a-E_a+cP_a-cP_a)-P_cT\\ =&M_c(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_cT. \qquad\text{(4.11a)}\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\langle w_1,L_1v_3\rangle=\quad M_c(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)-P_cM, \tag{4.11b}$$

$$\langle w_3,L_1v_1\rangle=-\,M_a(\alpha K_a-E_a)+P_aT, \tag{4.11c}$$

$$\langle w_3,L_1v_3\rangle=-\,M_a(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)+P_cM. \tag{4.11d}$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_2,L_1v_2\rangle =&\langle\partial_x^{-1}(M_au_c-M_cu_a),((\alpha+1)\Lambda^\alpha-f'(u)-c)u_x\rangle\\ =&-\alpha(\{M,U\}_{c,a}-cG). \qquad\text{(4.12)}\end{aligned}$$

To proceed, it is straightforward that

$$\langle w_1,L_2v_2\rangle=-2\alpha(\alpha+1)M_cK \quad\text{and}\quad \langle w_3,L_2v_2\rangle=2\alpha(\alpha+1)M_aK, \tag{4.13}$$

while since differentiating (4.9) and (4.8) in $x\partial_x+T\partial_T$ leads with help of (2.34) and (3.14) to that

$$\begin{aligned}2\alpha K-2(\Omega K)_\Omega-(\Omega U)_\Omega-&\int_0^T uf'(u)(xu_x+Tu_T)\;dx+2c(\Omega P)_\Omega+a(\Omega M)_\Omega\\ =2\alpha K-(\Omega K)_\Omega-(\Omega E)_\Omega-&\int_0^T uf'(u)(xu_x+Tu_T)\;dx+c(\Omega P)_\Omega=0\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^T f'(u)(xu_x+Tu_T)\;dx-c(\Omega M)_\Omega=0,$$

respectively, we calculate in view of (2.33) that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_1L_1L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle =&\langle L_1w_1,\psi\rangle-G^{-1}\langle w_1,\psi\rangle\langle L_1w_1,v_1\rangle\\ =&M_c(\alpha(\alpha-1)K-(\Omega(\alpha K-E))_\Omega) \qquad\text{(4.14a)}\\ &-G^{-1}(M_c(\Omega P)_\Omega-P_c(\Omega M)_\Omega)(M_c(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_cT).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w_3, L_1L_0^{-1}L_1v_2\rangle =&\langle L_1w_3,\psi\rangle - G^{-1}\langle w_1,\psi\rangle\langle L_1w_3, v_1\rangle\\ =&-M_a(\alpha(\alpha-1)K-(\Omega(\alpha K-E))_\Omega) \qquad (4.14\text{b})\\ &+G^{-1}(M_c(\Omega P)_\Omega - P_c(\Omega M)_\Omega)(M_a(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_aT).\end{aligned}$$

To summarize, the "effective dispersion matrix" in (2.27) is given by

$$\mathbf{D}=\begin{pmatrix}0 & D_{12} & D_{13}\\ 1 & D_{22} & 0\\ D_{31} & D_{32} & D_{33}\end{pmatrix},$$

where, using (4.11a)-(4.11d), (4.12) and (4.13), (4.14a), (4.14b),

$$\begin{aligned}D_{12}=&-2\alpha^2GM_aK-G(\Omega(\alpha K-E))_\Omega\\ &+M_c((\Omega P)_\Omega-P_c(\Omega M)_\Omega)(M_a(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_aT),\\ D_{13}=&-M_a(\alpha K_a-E_a)+P_aT,\\ D_{22}=&-\alpha(\{M,U\}_{c,a}-cG)-M_a(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)+P_aM,\\ D_{31}=&M_c(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)-P_cM,\\ D_{32}=&2\alpha^2GM_cK-G(\Omega(\alpha K-E))_\Omega\\ &-M_c(\Omega P)_\Omega-P_c(\Omega M)_\Omega)(M_c(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_cT)\\ &+(M_c(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)-P_cM)\\ &\quad\cdot(\alpha\{M,U\}_{c,a}-cG+M_a(\alpha K_c-E_c+P)+P_cM),\\ D_{33}=&M_c(\alpha K_a-E_a)-P_cT.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover a complex eigenvalue of $\mathbf{D}$ implies instability and the characteristic polynomial, or equivalently $\det(\mathbf{D}-\mu G\mathbf{I})$, leads to the modulational instability index.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.9

We first prove (3.22) in finite dimensions. Recall from the Jacobi-Sturm sequence argument that the number of negative eigenvalues of an $n\times n$ matrix $\mathbf{M}=(m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ is equal to the number of sign changes in the sequence

$$1, m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots, m_n, \qquad (\text{A}.1)$$

where m_k is k-th principal minor, defined as

$$m_k=\det(m_{ij})_{i,j=1}^k.$$

Recall a duality formula for minor determinants: let I and J be subsets of $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ of size k, i.e., $|I|=|J|=k$, and let

$$\det_{I,J}(\mathbf{M})=\det(m_{i,j})_{i\in I, j\in J}.$$

If I', J' denote the complementary sets to I, J then

$$\det_{I,J}(\mathbf{M}^{-1})=(-1)^{(\sum_{i\in I}i+\sum_{j\in J}j)}\frac{\det_{J',I'}(\mathbf{M})}{\det(\mathbf{M})}. \qquad (\text{A}.2)$$

A proof based upon the Schur complement formula is found in [Ser10, pp. 41], for instance. This illustrates that inverse matrices take k-minor determinants to complementary $(n-k)$-minor determinants, similarly to that the Hodge-* operator acts on k-forms.

Suppose that $\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots \vec{e}_n$ form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots \vec{e}_k$ form a basis of S. By the Jacobi-Sturm sequence argument the number of negative eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}$ is equal to the number of sign changes in

$$1, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n,$$

and the number of negative eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}|_S$ is, similarly, equal to the number of sign changes in

$$1, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k.$$

By (A.2), moreover, the number of negative eigenvalues of $(\mathbf{M}^{-1})|_{S^\perp}$ is

$$1, \frac{m_{n-1}}{m_n}, \frac{m_{n-2}}{m_n}, \dots, \frac{m_k}{m_n}.$$

Therefore (3.22) follows.

To proceed, let $\mathbf{M}$ be invertible and bounded below with compact resolvant. Let $\lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2 \leqslant \lambda_3 \dots$ denote eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}$, and $v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots$ be the corresponding eigenvectors. Let S_n denote the subspace spanned by $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ and S and let $\mathbf{M}_n = \Pi_{S_n} \mathbf{M} \Pi_{S_n}$ denote the symmetric projection of M onto S_n. Then,

- (M1) $\mathbf{M}_n \to \mathbf{M}$ as $n \to \infty$ in the strong operator topology and $n_-(\mathbf{M}_n) = n_-(\mathbf{M})$ for n sufficiently large;
- (M2) If $\mathbf{M}$ is invertible then $\mathbf{M}_n : S_n \to S_n$ is invertible for n sufficiently large;
- (M3) $(\mathbf{M}_n)^{-1} \to \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ in the uniform operator topology and $n_-((\mathbf{M}_n)^{-1}|_{S\perp}) = n_-(\mathbf{M}^{-1}|_{S^\perp})$ for n sufficiently large;
- (M4) $\mathbf{M}|_S = \mathbf{M}_n|_S$.

Therefore (3.22) follows from a limiting argument.

Acknowledgements. JCB is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant No. DMS–1211364 and by a Simons Foundation fellowship. JCB would like to thank the Mathematics department at MIT for its hospitality during the writing of this paper. VMH is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant No. DMS–1008885, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign under the Campus Research Board grant No. 11162 and by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

References

[AL84] D Anderson and M Lisak, *Modulational instability of coherent optical-fiber transmission signals*, Opt. Lett. **9** (1984), no. 10, 468–470.

[APN08] Jaime Angulo Pava and Fábio M. A. Natali, *Positivity properties of the Fourier transform and the stability of periodic travelling-wave solutions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **40** (2008), no. 3, 1123–1151. MR 2452883 (2009i:35262)

[AT91] C. J. Amick and J. F. Toland, *Uniqueness and related analytic properties for the Benjamin-Ono equation—a nonlinear Neumann problem in the plane*, Acta Math. **167** (1991), no. 1-2, 107–126. MR 1111746 (92i:35099)

[BD09] Nate Bottman and Bernard Deconinck, *KdV cnoidal waves are spectrally stable*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **25** (2009), no. 4, 1163–1180. MR 2552133 (2011h:35239)

[Ben70] T. Brooke Benjamin, *Internal waves of permanent form in fluids of great depth*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics **29** (1970), no. 3, 559–592.

[BF67] T. Brooke Benjamin and J. E. Feir, *The disintegration of wave trains on deep water. Part 1. Thenry*, J. Fluid Mech. **27** (1967), no. 3, 417–437.

[BJ10] Jared C. Bronski and Mathew A. Johnson, *The modulational instability for a generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **197** (2010), no. 2, 357–400. MR 2660515 (2012f:35456)

[BM95] Thomas J. Bridges and Alexander Mielke, *A proof of the Benjamin-Feir instability*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **133** (1995), no. 2, 145–198. MR 1367360 (97c:76028)

[BN67] D. J. Benney and A. C. Newell, *The propagation of nonlinear wave envelopes*, J. Math. and Phys. **46** (1967), 133–139. MR 0241052 (39 #2397)

[Bou77] M. J Boussinesq, *Essai sur la théorie des eaux courants*, Mémoirs présentés par divers savants á l'Acad. des Sciences Inst. France (série 2) **23** (1877), 1–680.

[BSS87] J. L. Bona, P. E. Souganidis, and W. A. Strauss, *Stability and instability of solitary waves of Korteweg-de Vries type*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **411** (1987), no. 1841, 395–412. MR 897729 (88m:35128)

[CDLFM07] P. Cardaliaguet, F. Da Lio, N. Forcadel, and R. Monneau, *Dislocation dynamics: a non-local moving boundary*, Free boundary problems, Internat. Ser. Numer. Math., vol. 154, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2007, pp. 125–135. MR 2305351 (2007m:74025)

[Chi06] Carmen Chicone, *Ordinary differential equations with applications*, second ed., Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 34, Springer, New York, 2006. MR 2224508 (2006m:34001)

[CPV05] Scipio Cuccagna, Dmitry Pelinovsky, and Vitali Vougalter, *Spectra of positive and negative energies in the linearized NLS problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), no. 1, 1–29. MR 2094265 (2005k:35374)

[CT04] Rama Cont and Peter Tankov, *Financial modelling with jump processes*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Financial Mathematics Series, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2004. MR 2042661 (2004m:91004)

[DS09] Wolf-Patrick Düll and Guido Schneider, *Validity of Whitham's equations for the modulation of periodic traveling waves in the NLS equation*, J. Nonlinear Sci. **19** (2009), no. 5, 453–466. MR 2540165 (2011c:35532)

[FL12] Rupert Frank and Enno Lenzmann, *Uniqueness and nondegeneracy of ground states for* $(-\Delta)^2 Q + Q - Q^{\alpha+1} = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}$, Acta Math. (2012), to appear.

[FPU55] Enrico Fermi, J. Pasta, and S. Ulam, *Studies of nonlinear problems*, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (1955), no. LA-1940.

[GLM07] Fritz Gesztesy, Yuri Latushkin, and Konstantin A. Makarov, *Evans functions, Jost functions, and Fredholm determinants*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **186** (2007), no. 3, 361–421. MR 2350362 (2008k:34209)

[GLZ08] Fritz Gesztesy, Yuri Latushkin, and Kevin Zumbrun, *Derivatives of (modified) Fredholm determinants and stability of standing and traveling waves*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **90** (2008), no. 2, 160–200. MR 2437809 (2012b:47035)

[GSS87] Manoussos Grillakis, Jalal Shatah, and Walter Strauss, *Stability theory of solitary waves in the presence of symmetry. I*, J. Funct. Anal. **74** (1987), no. 1, 160–197. MR 901236 (88g:35169)

[Has72] Akira Hasegawa, *Theory and computer experiment on self-trapping instability of plasma cyclotron waves*, Physics of Fluids **15** (1972), no. 5, 870–881.

[Hay68] Emilie V. Haynsworth, *Determination of the inertia of a partitioned Hermitian matrix*, Linear Algebra and Appl. **1** (1968), no. 1, 73–81. MR 0223392 (36 #6440)

[HJ12] Vera Mikyoung Hur and Mathew A. Johnson, *Stability of periodic traveling waves for nonlinear dispersive equations*, preprint.

[HK95] Akira Hasegawa and Yuji Kodama, *Solitons in optical communications*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.

[Hur12] Vera Mikyoung Hur, *On the formation of singularities for surface water waves*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **11** (2012), no. 4, 1465–1474. MR 2900797

[Jos77] R. I. Joseph, *Solitary waves in a finite depth fluid*, J. Phys. A **10** (1977), no. 12, 225–227. MR 0455822 (56 #14056)

[JZ10] M. A. Johnson and K. Zumbrun, *Rigorous justification of the Whitham modulation equations for the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Stud. Appl. Math. **125** (2010), no. 1, 69–89. MR 2676781 (2011h:35249)

[KdV95] D Korteweg and G. de Vries, *On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular canal, and on a new type of long stationary waves*, Phil. Mag. **39** (1895), 422–443.

[KMR11] C. E. Kenig, Y. Martel, and L. Robbiano, *Local well-posedness and blow-up in the energy space for a class of L^2 critical dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **28** (2011), no. 6, 853–887. MR 2859931

[KP12] Todd Kapitula and Keith Promislow, *Stability indices for constrained self-adjoint operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), no. 3, 865–880. MR 2869071

[Kwo89] Man Kam Kwong, *Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ in $\mathbf{R}^n$*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **105** (1989), no. 3, 243–266. MR 969899 (90d:35015)

[Lig65] M. J. Lighthill, *Contributions to the theory of waves in non-linear dispersive systems*, IMA J. Appl. Math. **1** (1965), no. 3, 269–306.

[Lin08] Zhiwu Lin, *Instability of nonlinear dispersive solitary waves*, J. Funct. Anal. **255** (2008), no. 5, 1191–1224. MR 2455496 (2010m:35456)

[MB89] C. J. McKinstrie and R. Bingham, *The modulational instability of coupled waves*, Physics of Fluids B **1** (1989), 230–237.

[New85] Alan C. Newell, *Solitons in mathematics and physics*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, vol. 48, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1985. MR 847245 (87h:35314)

[Ono75] Hiroaki Ono, *Algebraic solitary waves in stratified fluids*, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **39** (1975), no. 4, 1082–1091. MR 0398275 (53 #2129)

[Ost67] L. A. Ostrovsky, *Propagation of wave packets in nonlinear dispersive medium*, Sov. J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **24** (1967), 797–800.

[OZ03a] M. Oh and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of periodic solutions of conservation laws with viscosity: analysis of the Evans function*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **166** (2003), no. 2, 99–166. MR 1957127 (2004c:35270a)

[OZ03b] ———, *Stability of periodic solutions of conservation laws with viscosity: pointwise bounds on the Green function*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **166** (2003), no. 2, 167–196. MR 1957128 (2004c:35270b)

[PW92] Robert L. Pego and Michael I. Weinstein, *Eigenvalues, and instabilities of solitary waves*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **340** (1992), no. 1656, 47–94. MR 1177566 (93g:35115)

[Ser05] Denis Serre, *Spectral stability of periodic solutions of viscous conservation laws: large wavelength analysis*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **30** (2005), no. 1-3, 259–282. MR 2131054 (2006f:35178)

[Ser10] ———, *Matrices*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 216, Springer, New York, 2010, Theory and applications. MR 2744852 (2011i:15001)

[THT86] K. Tai, A. Hasegawa, and A. Tomita, *Observation of modulational instability in optical fibers*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986), no. 2, 135–138.

[Wei87] Michael I. Weinstein, *Existence and dynamic stability of solitary wave solutions of equations arising in long wave propagation*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **12** (1987), no. 10, 1133–1173. MR 886343 (88h:35107)

[Whi67] G. B. Whitham, *Non-linear dispersion of water waves*, J. Fluid Mech. **27** (1967), 399–412. MR 0208903 (34 #8711)

[Whi74] ———, *Linear and nonlinear waves*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 1974. MR 0483954 (58 #3905)

[Zak68a] V. E. Zakharov, *Instability of self-focusing of light*, Sov. J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **26** (1968), 994.

[Zak68b] ———, *Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on the surface of a deep fluid*, J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys. **9** (1968), no. 2, 190–194.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1409 W Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801

E-mail address: `jared@math.uiuc.edu`

E-mail address: `verahur@math.uiuc.edu`